

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_96655</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Sustained Ventricular Tachycardia: A Review of Treatment and Prognosis.</b>
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript reviews existing literature as a part of a thesis. While not providing new information, it is a concise summary of a complex topic. As such, it will be useful to non-specialists dealing with this common condition. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract is comprehensive. 4. Yes, they are appropriate. 5. There are two mistakes. A) The introduction states that verapamil is a drug of choice for VT. This is incorrect. The cited reference merely suggests verapamil for research into VT. CCBs are only recommended for RVOT VT. B) The discussion states that adenosine is drug of choice to distinguish between VT and SVT with aberration. This is incorrect. As the citation mentions, adenosine can be unsafe in VT and used for distinguishing between the two only if safer methods fail. 6. The references are sufficient and recent.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, it is a decent review for the stated purpose. The two factual errors need correction before publication, however.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nishad Chitnis</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Heart Care Clinic, India</b>