

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123802
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillator (ICD) vs. Medical Therapy in Reducing Mortality in Patients with Heart Failure: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
Type of the Article	

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>
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.	The topic of the manuscript is utterly important, on the other hand, it is not a hot topic, and doesn't add new information to previous studies and meta-analysis. The majority of the included studies are before 2010 and the latest article is already 3 years old.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable.	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive but language should be refined. "ICD is one of the most useful and widely used gadgets" Using "gadget" is inappropriate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It is appropriate.	
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.	It is scientifically acceptable, and the methodology is strict and consistent. However, it is not a patient-level data meta-analysis. A subgroup analysis for RCT and observational studies would be valuable, as these studies have different evidence levels	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language quality is not suitable for scholarly communication, it has to be improved. Avoid using term gadget for 2ICD.</p> <p>-<i>“More speculation is needed for designing definitive conclusions and tracking more extended benefits and impaired effects, specifically among minority communities.” Should be rephrased.</i></p> <p>“The current medical therapy does little to alter the heart failure outcome; overall five, five year mortality ranges between 10% and 60% depending on the type of heart failure; it can, however, go above 50% in some cases” What does overall five function on the sentence?</p> <p>- “The underlying mechanism commonly witnesses ventricular arrhythmias” should be rephrased</p> <p>-“The ICD is an implantable device used in recording and monitoring life-threatening arrhythmias like ventricular tachycardia and ventricular fibrillation; it also shocks the heart to establish a regular pulse.”It can be suitable in popular science magazines, but not in scholarly communication.</p> <p>- “overwhelming evidence that ICDs dramatically cut mortality” cut should be replaced.</p> <p>-“did not meet the eligibility criteria, mainly due to non-compliance with the inclusion criteria”Avoid using non-compliance in this context</p> <p>- “these devices afford an added layer of protection against SCD, which is not infrequently the mode of death in patients with HF.” Should be rephrased</p> <p>- please add this article as reference, as it is stated that the response and improvement in LVEF is strongly associated with the decreased risk of major ventricular arrhythmia events and the need for ICD.</p> <p>REF: Eur Heart J. 2023 Oct 21;44(40):4259-4269. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehad591</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, it is an important and good choice of topic, however, it lacks freshness and is poorly executed in terms of language.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Bela Merkely</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Semmelweis University, Hungary</p>