

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_111255</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Diagnostic Significance of the Holter Monitoring in the Evaluation of Palpitation at Tanta University Hospitals</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for scientific purpose and community. This paper may be helpful or useful for further research's.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive but there should be no subheadings included in the abstract. The abstract should be 150 to 200 words only because a long abstract seems boring to the reader.</p> <p>4. The result and conclusion should be at last of the manuscript not be included in the abstract at the beginning.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. No, references are not sufficient. There should be more references included.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, english quality is best for scholarly communication.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prianka
Department, University & Country	Chandigarh University, India