

On impact of articles published in Heart, Vessels and Transplantation and on responding to reviewers' comments



Dear Readers,

In this last issue for year 2019, we are glad to announce that our journal now is being read in 163 countries and 3353 cities around the world. Total downloads of articles has reached 130178. You may find the most read and downloaded articles for years 2017, 2018 and 2019 in Table 1 (With special thanks to our web editor Pavel Tiumkin for preparation of statistics and table).

Heart, Vessels and Transplantation is a double-blind peer-reviewed journal, which means manuscripts undergo review by editors and external reviewers, experts in the field of the topics, presented in manuscripts. We implement a double-blind peer-review process (1), when neither authors nor reviewers are aware of each other's identities. Reviewers' role is very important in reviewing of articles, based on their theoretical and practical expertise they provide comments that improve clarity and quality of reviewed manuscripts (1-5). Their work is volunteer and without monetary compensation. Authors should understand and acknowledge significance of peer-review process, reviewers' and editors' comments when receive the decision letters from editors: accept, accept with minor revision, accept with major revision (often revise and resubmit), reject. When receive a letter with query of revision, authors have a chance to revise manuscript

according with comments of reviewers and editors and increase the likelihood of their manuscript to be accepted for publication. Evidence showed that when revision was experienced as difficult and complex by authors, they were also more satisfied with improvements in their article because of peer-review (6).

However, due to lack of experience (5, 7) it is not uncommon also when editors receive only revised version of manuscript with or without cover letter, but often without list of changes and responses to reviewers' comments. Many editors addressed issues of dealing with decision on articles and creating response to reviewers' and editors' comments (2-5, 7-11), thus guiding authors how to participate in peer-review by responding to comments, revising and improving quality of their work.

There are several main rules of responding to reviewers' comments: respond completely, politely and with evidence (9) and as soon as possible without delays (11).

Read carefully editors' decision letter and reviewers' comments, instructions for authors. The letter from editor might contain additional instructions how to submit revision. Read and revise your manuscript in view of proposed changes and comments.

Address for Correspondence: Gulmira Kudaiberdieva, Heart, Vessels and Transplantation

Email: editor@hvt-journal.com

Received: 20.11.2019 **Accepted:** 22.11.2019

Copyright © 2019 Heart, Vessels and Transplantation

doi: 10.24969/hvt.2019.173

Reviewers` comments generally include major general comment on the study and specific comments. Prioritize comments, as they may include recommendations and requests regarding clarification of text, providing additional methodological details of study; data interpretation; request to re-analyze data or to conduct new additional experiments. It is advised to thank reviewers first, then respond to each comment completely, and politely, provide the changes in manuscript done according with reviewer`s recommendation/comment. Remember reviewers` work is volunteer and is aimed to improve your study presentation. In case of requests to re-analyze data, consider your options if necessary seek statistician advice; if there is recommendation to conduct additional experiments – set the new protocol and start work. In both circumstances, if you feel it will take longer time (>21 days for our journal) to revise, notify editors and ask for extension of revision time. If the requests of reviewers cannot be met, for example conducting new experiments in the absence of necessary equipment is not possible; you should politely explain why it cannot be done and inform also editor. If you disagree with reviewers` comments, do it respectfully and politely, supporting with evidence (available literature).

Although reviewers are the experts in the field of your study, their expertise might cover different aspects and there might be sometimes diverse opinions of reviewers. You should respond politely why you prefer one opinion to another, supporting by evidence.

Often, shortening of manuscript is requested, you should follow the recommendation to do so. As the submission of manuscript, its evaluation and responding to reviewers` and editors` comments take time, it is advised to re-check available literature on the topic before submitting revision.

Arrange your responses to reviewers` and editors` comments document in the following order: copy and paste comments of reviewers and place your answer below each comment in different font, style, include specific changes (additions, deletions) in document denoting page, paragraph and lines. Enumerate reviewers` comments (Reviewer 1. Comment 1, Reviewer 2. Comment 1). Submit your Responses to reviewers` and editors` comments document along with cover letter to the editor and revised manuscript. Avoid unnecessary delays in submitting revision.

In this issue of the journal we published research articles on structure of chronic heart failure referrals and hospitalizations in tertiary centers, outcomes of combined surgery, review article on advanced methods of left ventricular function assessment, very rare case report on complication of valve replacement surgeries, two interesting quizzes on ICD therapy and electrocardiogram, news from arrhythmia school and papers from two conferences.

The journal now has online manuscript submission system – www.hvt-journal.com/submission/login, one should first register to obtain an account (www.hvt-journal.com/submission/register) and start uploading manuscript and submitting it. All manuscripts should be submitted using online submission system, though we continue to receive by email as well for some period of time.

With best wishes in 2020 and we look forward for manuscripts submissions.

Gulmira Kudaiberdieva
Editor-in-Chief

Heart, Vessels and Transplantation

Peer-review: Internal

Conflict of interest: None to declare

Authorship: G.K.

Acknowledgement: With special thanks to web editor of Heart, Vessels and Transplantation - Pavel Tiumkin for preparation of web statistics and table

Funding: None to declare

References

1. Ali PA, Watson R. Peer review and the publication process. *Nurs Open* 2016;3: 193-202.
2. Provenzale JM. Revising a manuscript: ten principles to guide success for publication. *AJR* 2010; 195: W382-7.
3. Feldman DC. Negotiating the revision process. *J Management* 2004; 30: 305-7.
4. Noble WS. Ten simple rules for writing a response to reviewers. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2017; 13: e1005730.
5. Conn VS. Manuscript revision strategies. *West J Nurs Res* 2007; 29: 786-8.
6. Huisman J, Smits J. Duration and quality of the peer review process: the author`s perspective. *Scientometrics* 2017; 113: 633-50.

7. Nahata MC, Sorkin EM. Responding to manuscript reviewer and editor comments. *Ann Pharmacother* 2019; 53: 959–61.
 8. Baker WL, DiDomenico RJ, Haines ST. Improving peer review: What authors can do. *Am J Health-Syst Pharm* 2017; 74: 2076-9.
 9. Williams HC. How to reply to referees' comments when submitting manuscripts for publication. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2004; 51: 79-83.

10. Annesley TM. Top 10 tips for responding to reviewer and editor comments. *Clin Chem* 2011; 57: 551-4.
 Conn VS. Manuscript revision strategies. *West J Nurs Res* 2007; 29: 786-8.
 11. Morse J. "Revise and resubmit": responding to reviewers reports. *Qual Health Res* 1996; 6: 149-151.

Table 1. The Most Downloaded Articles – Heart, Vessels and Transplantation

2017				
Year/Volume/ Issue	Title	DOI	Downloads	Views
2017; Vol 1: Issue 2	In Memory of Professor Galen S. Wagner M.D., Ph.D. (1939 - 2016) – our mentor, colleague and friend	10.24969/hvt.2017.14	2894	3814
2017; Vol 1: Issue 1	Atria: A comprehensive evaluation with echocardiography	10.24969/hvt.2017.8	2397	4586
2017; Vol 1: Issue 1	Interpretation of uncommon ECG findings in patients with atrial flutter	10.24969/hvt.2017.6	2347	6880
Ahead of print publication	On sweet undeniable feeling of power of international intellectual feudalism, bias, discrimination, censoring, theft, and yet cloud of rumors again – Part 1	10.24969/hvt.2017.35	2210	3368
2017; Vol 1: Issue 2	Postpericardiotomy syndrome and its complications: prevalence, clinical significance and management	10.24969/hvt.2017.10	2162	5774
2018				
2018; Vol 2: Issue 1	Echocardiographic evaluation of heart valve prosthetic dysfunction	10.24969/hvt.2017.46	2100	4960
2018; Vol 2: Issue 1	Diet of schoolchildren as a risk factor of nutritional disorders	10.24969/hvt.2017.40	1558	2360
2018; Vol 2: Issue 2	Answer to Quiz Electrocardiogram on page 65 and case discussion	10.24969/hvt.2018.60	1547	1489
2018; Vol 2: Issue 3	International Interdisciplinary School IRIS, June 11-16, 2018, Issyk-Kul, Kyrgyzstan	10.24969/hvt.2018.69	1521	1629
2018; Vol 2: Issue 1	What research topic is the "hot" research topic?	10.24969/hvt.2017.37	1499	2066
2019				
2019; Vol 3: Issue 3	Technological advances in cardiac pacing and defibrillation	10.24969/hvt.2019.129	1124	1429
2019; Vol 3: Issue 1	The experience of teacher's academic mobility of the University of Girona (Spain) and I.K. Akhunbaev Kyrgyz State Medical Academy (Kyrgyzstan) in the framework of the international program Erasmus+	10.24969/hvt.2019.105	937	1099
2019; Vol 3: Issue 1	Requirements for research manuscripts submitted for consideration for publication in Heart Vessels and Transplantation	10.24969/hvt.2019.109	797	1245
2019; Vol 3: Issue 1	Quiz: Echocardiography	10.24969/hvt.2019.103	794	1009
2019; Vol 3: Issue 2	Combined approach of perioperative antithromboembolic management in abdominal and thyroid surgery	10.24969/hvt.2019.114	791	1064