

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_CA_129390 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Becoming post-angioplasty patients: experience of the Avicenne military hospital in Marrakech |
| Type of the Article | Case report |

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the outcomes of coronary angioplasty, particularly within the context of a regional healthcare facility. By analyzing clinical, demographic, and procedural data, the study highlights both the successes and challenges of this life-saving intervention, contributing to a deeper understanding of factors influencing short- and long-term patient outcomes. The inclusion of detailed information on complications and recurrence rates offers critical evidence to guide improvements in patient management and secondary prevention strategies. Furthermore, the findings underscore the role of technological advancements, such as drug-eluting stents, in enhancing procedural efficacy and survival rates, making it a vital reference for clinicians and researchers in the cardiovascular field.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>"Evaluating the Clinical and Procedural Outcomes of Coronary Angioplasty: Insights from a Regional Hospital in Morocco"</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>This study evaluates the short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes of coronary angioplasty in patients with acute coronary syndromes (ACS) at the Avicenne Military Hospital in Marrakech. A retrospective analysis was conducted on 250 patients over a three-year period, focusing on procedural success, complications, and the role of technological advancements such as drug-eluting stents. The findings revealed high angiographic success rates, with complications including rhythm disturbances (2.8%) and stent thrombosis (2.8%). Despite a recurrence rate of 5% within six months, long-term outcomes showed improved survival and reduced hospitalizations. These results underscore the importance of multidisciplinary management, strict risk factor control, and patient education in enhancing clinical outcomes and quality of life.</p> | |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p> | <p>The manuscript is scientifically accurate in its methodological design, data analysis, and discussion of results. The study provides a comprehensive evaluation of coronary angioplasty outcomes over three years, supported by quantitative data on success rates, complications, and long-term results. The findings align with international studies, particularly regarding improved outcomes with drug-eluting stents, enhancing the study's reliability. Furthermore, the systematic approach and clear analysis offer a valuable knowledge base for improving treatment practices and follow-up care.</p> <p>However, the study requires enhancements to strengthen its scientific rigor. Details on the statistical methods used should be included, along with confidence intervals and statistical values to validate the results. It is also recommended to clarify the limitations associated with the retrospective design and focus on comparing the findings with similar regional studies. Lastly, updating the references to include recent research in this field and providing more details on long-term follow-up procedures would enhance the reliability and scientific value of the results.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>The references in the manuscript are informative and relevant to the topic but are not sufficiently recent to reflect the latest advancements in coronary angioplasty. Most of the cited studies are from the early 2000s, with some dating back to the 1980s. While these references provide a historical foundation, the lack of recent sources may limit the manuscript's applicability to current clinical practices.</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Areas for Improvement: Grammatical and Stylistic Issues: Some sentences are overly lengthy or complex, which may confuse readers. Simplifying sentence structures and improving punctuation would enhance readability. Minor grammatical errors, such as subject-verb agreement and article usage, are present and should be corrected. Scholarly Tone: The manuscript occasionally uses conversational phrases that are not suitable for academic writing. For example, instead of saying "This technical act should not be isolated," consider rephrasing to "This procedure should be accompanied by comprehensive patient management." Passive voice can be used more frequently to emphasize objectivity, which is common in scholarly communication. | |
| Optional/General comments | Based on the content of the manuscript, there do not appear to be any overt ethical issues. | |

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: | Azzam Jamil Falah Al-Rifae |
| Department, University & Country | The University of Jordan, Jordan, Jordan |