

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_96417
Title of the Manuscript:	A RARE SUPRA-VENTRICULAR ARRHYTHMIA REVEALING A LEFT VENTRICULAR NON-COMPACTION CARDIOMYOPATHY IN A YOUNG WOMAN. CASE REPORT.
Type of the Article	Case 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. Yes. This is a manuscript that reports an important case study for information for the scientific community regarding supraventricular arrhythmia in a 44-year-old man.</p> <p>2 Yes. The title is suitable</p> <p>3 The abstract is well described and easy to understand.</p> <p>4 The work is well distributed with its description sections following a sequence.</p> <p>5. Yes. Scientifically speaking, the article contains rich and important information for the reader from different areas. I rank very important for readings.</p> <p>Bibliographical references are appropriate to the topic to which the scientific article refers. The discourse of the text is current and explicit.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The description regarding the English language used is well placed, scientifically simple and easy to understand and read. Of course, undergraduate students, graduate students and professors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The work is very meaningful and good. This is a case study that addresses a cardiac arrhythmia. It is a current issue that even impacts the area of physical activity and health, as well as the area of cardiology revealing the rare supraventricular arrhythmia revealing ventricular noncompact cardiomyopathy in a 44-year-old woman</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Doutora Antonia Dalla Pria Bankoff
Department, University & Country	Universidade Estadual De Campinas, Brasil