Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CA_87105**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Epidemiology of pacemaker implantation among patients in Tanta university hospitals**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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

(https://www.journalca.com/index.php/CA/editorial-policy)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Does not mention the objectives nor justification of the study - The study design is deficient to identify risk factors (cases/controls or cohort) - If the objective is to identify risk factors, it is necessary to determine odds ratio or relative risk, attributable risk … - The results are repetitive with respect to the information in the tables, it does not provide more information	
Minor REVISION comments	- The title of the study is confusing and does not describe the content of the article - Does not explain why the total number of subjects in tables 2 (180) and 3 (202) is greater than the number of patients studied (102) - tables 6 and 7 are not mentioned in the manuscript - Some results can be presented through figures - The text mentions "smoking (24%)", and the table "smoking (23%)" - Explain "normally distributed variables were summarized using the mean and standard deviation (SD), while the normally distributed variables were summarized using the median"	
Optional/General comments	- what is meant by" This study describes cardiac pacing activity during 2021" - tables display data out of order	

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*** Si, - It does not specify if was reviewed and approved by the Human Research Ethics Committees of the Tanta university hospital informed consent letter is mentioned, but it is not specified if the consent was for the placement of the pacemaker or to participate in the study (6 months follow-up)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Octavio Amancio Chassin**
Department, University & Country	**Hospital General de México Dr Eduardo Liceaga, México**