



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_28381
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of age in prosthesis-patient mismatch on long-term survival after aortic valve replacement: in-vitro versus in-vivo values
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	The authors studied the impact of age in prosthesis-patient mismatch on long-term survival after aortic valve replacement. Some problems existed. 1. Use of Abbreviations: When first using an abbreviation, you should give the full phrase. For example, prosthesis-patient mismatch (PPM). Later, you can always use the abbreviation PPM without mentioning the full phrase. However, the authors did not abide by this rule all the time. They first used some abbreviations without giving the complete phrase like EAOi, AVR, CABG, and PPM (in the text). Later, they used prosthesis-patient mismatch in the RESULTS again. The reader will not know what these abbreviations stand for. Please check the whole article and correct all similar problems. If one phrase was used only once in the text, there is no need to give the abbreviation, and you can use the full phrase. Other examples include iEOA, SE, df etc. 2. In vitro and in vivo: What do these words mean here in the text? What are you trying to convey? 3. Prosthesis-patient mismatch: What does this phrase mean? These problems should have been explained in the METHODS part so that the readers will understand exactly what you mean by these phrases. Or else there may be problems in communications. Some words or phrases were not explained clearly enough. For these words, you are very clear but the reader do not know if they mean the same thing as you understood. 4. METHODOLOGY: What does the following sentence mean? "The cut-off point for xenografts implantation	1. Agreed with Reviewer's comments and all abbreviations have been preceded by the full terminology. All corrections are highlighted 2. In-vitro: derived from manufacturers' data In-vivo: derived from independent researchers' data obtained in patients 3. PPM (when the effective orifice area of the prosthetic valve is too small for the patient's body size) explanation now included and highlighted 4. The cut off point was set at age 70



SDI Review Form 1.6

	was set at 70? What does 70 mean here? 5. Tables: The authors used a lot of tables here. However, these tables are very difficult to understand with some specialized words in the statistics. The best way to make your work understandable is to make the tables simpler and easier, especially by use of figures. If some figures can better show the trend, do not use a table. Take Table 2 for example: There is not enough information for the reader to understand this table. What does source mean in the table? What do vitro and vivo mean? How do you use reference here in the table? I am at a total loss as to what the authors are trying to convey. What do 19, 21, 23, 25 mean? Please add some more information here so that no problems existed for communication. For Tables 3-6, figures can be used to show more directly the trend of regression. If you do need some tables, please use notes under the table to explain some special words like some abbreviations including SE, df, CI, PPM and so on and so forth. Your article is to make it easier enough for the reader to understand what you are trying to convey. In conclusion, the authors did not explain clearly enough some special words and phrase before doing the work. The authors did not mention whether this study was approved by some ethics committee and whether the informed consent had been obtained from the patients.	5. We used figures to illustrate the significance of age on long-term survival. We used tables in order to define the statistical analysis of each set of parameter we were testing. 6. Footnote is added to the table to explain source as regards in-vivo and in-vitro Explanation is given for reference 19, 21, 23, 25 and now more clearly marked size 19, size 21, size 23 and size 25 and footnote is added Footnotes have been added to fully explain the abbreviated statistical terminology Explanations are added and highlighted A Note on Ethical Approval is given before the references section
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		