

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_96350
Title of the Manuscript:	SCREENNING OF ARRHYTHMIAS IN PATIENTS TREATED FOR HEART FAILURE IN PARAKOU IN 2017
Type of the 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The authors are treating an important subject by screening the arrhythmias in patients treated for heart failure in Parakou. My concern is why is the manuscript referring to the data obtained in 2017? There have passed at least 5 years....</p> <p>The title is in accordance with the content of the study.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive, the keyword Benin should be removed and the name of the country should be mentioned after the name of the city, Parakou.</p> <p>The subsections are appropriately structured, I miss some ECGs performed on the patients.. The result part would be more convincing. The discussion part could be better formulated, there are too many comparisons with other studies, maybe some could be left out.</p> <p>The references part has many deficiencies, I marked them in red. On my opinion there are too many references, some of them are old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It could be improved, I suggest some changes...in red</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Barabas Eniko
Department, University & Country	University of Medicine, Pharmacy, Science and Technology, Romania