

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_123179
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on unguided temporary pacing via the jugular vein at the Mohamed VI University Hospital of Marrakech: safety, effectiveness and practicability
Type of the Article	Case study

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Call answered to review the paper titled: Case study : Study on unguided temporary pacing via the jugular vein at the Mohamed VI University Hospital of Marrakech: safety, effectiveness and practicability</p> <p>Introduction This paper addresses an important concern in clinical practice seen in developing nations with poor resources. It highlights the rate of complications occurring in an invalidated study and fills a gap in literature. However, it is felt wanting in terms of grammar and syntax as well as quantifiable measurements in case of success rates of the study. It also requires ethical clearance to conduct such an experimental study.</p> <p>Major Corrections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 16 Methods: Was informed consent for the procedure taken from the patients? Was ethical clearance taken from the hospital which had residents perform the procedures? It needs to be mentioned. 2. Conclusions: inadequate. "high success rate and low complication rate" should be adequately quantified. <p>Minor Corrections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Punctuation and grammar in the abstract to be corrected. 2. Referencing to begin with first reference not reference 13. In line 10. 3. Line 28. Please use better colour and bigger font for the pie chart. 4. The manuscript is to be corrected for punctuation and grammar 5. Line 107. Majority were minor. Kindly use appropriate metrics to denote the significance of findings. 6. This should be titled case series. Not case study. 7. References to be in Vancouver style. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>		
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sharath Krishnaswam
Department, University & Country	India