

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	a cross-sectional, descriptive and analytical original study

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>1. The manuscript is important for the local scientific community in order to evaluate the differences compared to other countries</p> <p>2. The title is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. The manuscript is quite well organized but while the authors have analyzed many parameters, i.e socioeconomic status, educational levels, marital status etc, they do not mention the results.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct but the differences among the countries are not sufficiently justified.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but additional references will be necessary if the rest of the analysed factors will be added.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language needs improvement (i.e screening, etc)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the current cross-sectional, descriptive and analytical original study in Parakou make a screening of the arrhythmias, the types, and the predisposing factors. In order to really understand some of the main points, some general information about Parakou is necessary. Furthermore, the analysis of the demographic factors is necessary in relation to heart failure to better explain the differences among studies in various countries</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Charis Liapi
Department, University & Country	National and Kapodistrian University, Greece