

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_117441</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PREDICTORS OF MORTALITY IN INFECTIVE ENDOCARDITIS: A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. Infectious endocarditis refers to the colonization of cardiac valve endocardium by virulent microorganisms. It is a rare condition that can lead to rapid morbidity and mortality if not efficiently diagnosed and treated. Microorganisms from other infections can easily get into the bloodstream and attach to damaged areas in the heart. Endocarditis is more likely to be because of artificial heart valves, damaged heart valves or other heart defects. Without quick treatment, endocarditis can damage or destroy the heart valves.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is Clear and concise</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the research. The abstract is easy to read and understand.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is easy to follow. The subsections are informative.</p> <p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology and results are presented in a clear and concise manner.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>Overall, I think the manuscript is well-written. It is likely to be of interest to a wide range of researchers</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>B. Kanimozhi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dr. NGP Arts and Science College, India</b>