

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_96444
Title of the Manuscript:	Infective endocarditis: experience of the Cardiology Department of the Mohammed VI University Hospital
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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>y</p> <p>y</p> <p>y</p> <p>y</p> <p>y</p> <p>y</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	y	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This research is interesting. The authors are advised to cite the percent of complications: Renal failure and Ischemic stroke in Abstract as cited in the main text. The authors cited that the percent of neurological complication was 12 percent while in the main text it was 15% how comes? Cite both the standard Deviation of the mean throughout the main text and two-sided t test with confidence interval before each P value. What are the potential confounding factors The authors are advised to explain the male predominance in their study as well as the 5easins behind diagnostic delay? Discussion is too short, and it is better to extend it to include similar retrospective studies. Other recent observational and meta-analytic studies and provide references in 2020 to 2023. Strength and limitations of the study is also recommended.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hassan A Shora
Department, University & Country	Port-Said University, Egypt