

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_90768
Title of the Manuscript:	Etiology and Age Distribution of Syncope in Delta Area Patients
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:

(<https://www.journalca.com/index.php/CA/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Grammatical mistakes checked by using www.grammarly.com It shows the score of 54% out of 100% of the manuscript which shows paper seriously need to be corrected for publication, try to ask help from English native to help in these issues.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> After the conclusion part, conflict of interest is not mentioned in the manuscript. Title of Manuscript is not appropriate, "Etiology and age distribution of syncope" in African-American population" is already online. Yours is showing only the difference of delta region, the title is alike. Precise the type of syncope in your manuscript to attract the readers for reading it. Something like "Age Distribution in Delta region show predominance of idiopathic syncope" And in the limitation of study, last sentence "Finally, currently available risk stratification scores should not be used alone to perform risk stratification in the Emergency Department." Limitation is mentioned but future recommendation is missing. Why it shouldn't be used alone and what is the alternative to be used? 	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript doesn't include figures, imaging results including CT/MRI with high resolution must be added to show the accuracy of result. Also the ECG result of patients suffering from symptom's is missing. Paper mention age distribution, but it is more focused on risk factors and symptoms of patients. If age distribution was counted in paper, the study would compare both groups of before and after 40 age group showing symptoms and adverse symptoms separately that would be interesting part in the paper. So comparison of aging is lacking, This topic needs further studies on syncope relative to cardiology issues that can lead to mortality rate, emphasizing mechanical study, clinical trial of treatment groups and early prevention studies in loss of consciousness (LOC) with good neurological results highlighting incidence ratio s in different population.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iftikhar Hassa
Department, University & Country	Wuhan University, China