

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_99423
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence and Characteristics of Postoperative Atrial Fibrillation in Sudanese Patients Undergoing Heart Valve Surgery: A Descriptive Retrospective Study
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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The paper describes the incidence and risk factors of postoperative atrial fibrillation (POAF) in Sudanese patients undergoing heart valve surgery. Postoperative atrial fibrillation is commonly observed in the hospital setting after cardiac surgery and valve surgery. Thus, the topic of the paper is quite useful for medical community. 2. The title of the paper is appropriate to the described subject matter in the paper. 3. Abstract of the paper is crisp and appropriate. 4. The sections and sub-sections of the manuscript are relevant, properly numbered aligned logically. 5. The manuscript describes a commonly prevailing phenomenon and hence in tune with the existing body of knowledge for the subject matter. 6. The descriptive study nature of the manuscript leads to quite a good number of references and also the references are new as well as old; as expected.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of presentation of the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Durgaprasad Kamat
Department, University & Country	Sinhgad Academy of Engineering, SPPU, India