

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Cardiology*

**Manuscript NO:** 86633

**Title:** Clinical impact of portal vein pulsatility on the prognosis of hospitalized patients with acute heart failure

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02446043

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACC

**Professional title:** Lecturer

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Malaysia

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-07-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu (Quit 2023)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-05 01:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-07 04:56

**Review time:** 2 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting paper using PV pulsatility ratio (PVPR) as a marker of RAP and to be a prognostic marker of heart failure. It can be accepted after minor revisions 1. In writing up on tertiles of different groups, the last tertile should not be written  $0.21 < \text{PVPR}$  but as  $\text{PVPR} > 0.21$ . Please correct everywhere in the text and figures, to make it easier for readers to follow the article. ( Eg: "PVPR-T1:  $0 \leq \text{PVPR} \leq 0.08$ , PVPR-T2:  $0.08 < \text{PVPR} \leq 0.21$ , PVPR-T3:  $\text{PVPR} > 0.21$ ") 2. Fig 1D should be put as a separate Table. 3. In Fig 3, "PVPR-T3 had a worse prognosis than the lower PVPR tertiles (log-rank test:  $P < 0.05$ )" should be shown on the figure with \* and labelled  $*p < 0.05$