

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_119901
Title of the Manuscript:	Nursing care for patients with Atrial Flutter undergoing catheter ablation: Integrative review
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript is looking great and important to the scientific community, especially that they outputting in the form of integrative review. • The title is suitable and attract. • The abstract is comprehensive, well arranged, precise, and informative, appeared the main idea of research, and major findings. But there is scarcity of methods, as it was not explained how he arrived to these result especially the conclusion. • The subsections and structure is appropriate. • The researcher followed the scientific methods as they mentioned in the methodology, so the manuscript is correct scientifically. • The references are sufficient. • The conclusion part needs revision and adding. Is looking like recommendation and justification. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is clear which make the manuscript well understood by the readers in the first reading, so is suitable for scholarly communications. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, the researcher's effort is appreciated, but he needs to clarify the purpose of the study more to make it stronger. • The standard used to summarize the studies, obtain the results and the summary must also be clarified. • Add percentages to strengthen the results. • In the discussion part, must link the standard from references by the results obtained from the study clearly, by putting standard first then flowed by the result, showing the shortage. • The conclusion must be stated in clear way. 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alshazaly Abdoalghfar Adam
Department, University & Country	Academic of Engineering and Medical Sciences, Sudan