

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_115775
Title of the Manuscript:	Real world experience of the first cardio-oncology unit implantation in Morocco
Type of the Article	

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. the study is important because it is a patient population with traits specific to its population</p> <p>2.- It is not in accordance, it should be improved.</p> <p>3.- The summary does not involve the document's own information, it should be improved.</p> <p>4.- The subsections are not appropriate, in results there is information on methods and statistics, and in Discussion information is added that should be in the introduction, it should be restructured to facilitate reading and understanding of the information.</p> <p>6.-some references are missing in the text, the revision that the authors have made could improve and update the information.</p> <p>The document, which seems anecdotal, due to the fact that the methods have scattered information, should be made more specific in order to facilitate and document the validity of the results, taking advantage of the clinical review and other review procedures applied. Cardiological aspects that are of interest for its comparison, such as electrocardiograms, how they documented cardiopathies, how they were verified, etc., are not included.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I have no opinion.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The document, which seems anecdotal, due to the fact that the methods have scattered information, should be made more specific in order to facilitate and document the validity of the results, taking advantage of the clinical review and other review procedures applied. Cardiological aspects that are of interest for its comparison, such as electrocardiograms, how they documented cardiopathies, how they were verified, etc., are not included.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Maldonado Vega
Department, University & Country	Hospital Regional De Alta Especialidad Del Bajio, Mexico