

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_99479
Title of the Manuscript:	Predictors of rehospitalization in patients with chronic heart failure
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>)

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>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>1. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>2. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>3. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>4. 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>1. The manuscript is not too important for the scientific community, as there is a large body of published evidence on the topic of rehospitalization risk prediction in heart failure patients.</p> <p>2. The title should be changed to "Predictors of rehospitalization in patients with chronic heart failure – a single center study in Moroccan patients"</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. The discussion section needs to be expanded with more papers referenced. The authors would also do well to find the laboratory data of their patient pool and present the correlation between certain laboratory findings and rehospitalization risk (e.g. serum creatinine, NT-proBNP, serum troponin, urinary albumin to creatinine ratio etc).</p> <p>5. The manuscript is probably scientifically correct, although its findings are already well known and have been for a long time.</p> <p>6. There should be more references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language quality should be improved; suggestions have been provided in the annotated manuscript attached to this review.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ingrid Prkačin
Department, University & Country	Clinical Hospital, Croatia