



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_14459
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Right Ventricular Diastolic Function in Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Using Pulsed Doppler Tissue Imaging
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Cardiac Magnetic Resonance is the current reference standard to evaluate Right Ventricle performance, and it is true that it has several limitations, but not because of the risk of complications. Echocardiography and Pulsed Tissue Doppler Imaging are commonly used to evaluate RV function in all patients. As authors point out echocardiographic assessment of RV function is limited by the complex RV geometric shape. (Authors should comment on this in the Introduction). - References regarding the use of TDI for the evaluation of RV diastolic function in COPD (most of them) are not recent. (Authors should comment on this in the Introduction). - The number of patients of the study is low, and the authors write only a small sentence on this. Also, data was not compared with the gold standard. These are important issues. (Authors should comment on this in the Discussion). - Authors did not include figures / imaging, and they did not include any plot of some statistical analysis (Bland Altman, etc). (Authors should comment on this in the Results, and should comment why the statistics that they present in the manuscript were chosen).	- Related part changed on text. -Although there are many studies about the use of TDI for the evaluation of RV diastolic function (such as: 1. Akao M, Katsube Y, Kamisago M, Watanabe M, Abe M, Fukazawa R, Ogawa S, Itoh Y. Developmental changes in left and right ventricular function evaluated with color tissue Doppler imaging and strain echocardiography. J Nippon Med Sch. 2013;80(4):260-7. 2. Gromadziński L, Targoński R, Pruszczyk P. Assessment of right and left ventricular diastolic functions with tissue Doppler echocardiography in congestive heart failure patients with coexisting acute pulmonary embolism. Adv Clin Exp Med. 2014 May-Jun;23(3):371-6. 3. Zhu H, Yuan J, Wei C, Chen J, Wang Y. Evaluation of right ventricular function by Doppler tissue imaging of the tricuspid annulus in patients with acquired immune deficiency syndrome. Exp Ther Med. 2014 Mar;7(3):747-749) or RV systolic function in COPD



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Results of this study were compared in the discussion only with those of Caso et al. (Authors should comment on this in the Discussion, and should comment why they chose the statistics that they present in the manuscript).	patients without PHT (eg: Hilde JM et al. RV dysfunction and remodelling in COPD without PHT. J Am Coll Cardiol 2013; 62: 1103-1111), there are not so many about TDI evaluation for RV diastolic dysfunction in pts with COPD and without PHT. However one more study was added to references. - " Another important issue is the small sample size and the unable to compare the data with the gold standards like MRI" is added to discussion part. Moreover, " Finally, we certainly believe that this study should be repeated with a larger sample size to reach a final conclusion" is added to conclusion part - Figure 1 is added - As it was requested by the reviewer, multiple statistical methods could be used to analyze our data. However we preferred current statistical methods since they are simple, commonly used and easily understood. - Another study was added to discussion part for comparison (ref32)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		