



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_19731
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical Factors associated with Atrial Fibrillation in Congestive Heart Failure patients admitted at the University Teaching Hospital, Lusaka, Zambia
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The article looks at the clinical factors associated with AF in CHF px admitted at the UTH of Zambia. I HAVE THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS TO MAKE ABOUT THIS ARTICLE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I understand patients had to test positive for CHF before being screened for AF, if that's the case then the methodology in the abstract should indicate that. • Point out some of the clinical factors that the study analyses in the abstract • Keywords should not be contained in the title of the article. • Remove Lusaka Zambia from the key words as this does not academically and scientifically assist in the classification of your work • In line 43, its well stated that CHF predicts AF, which justifies that px had to be tested for CHF first, hence consider your methodology in he abstract. • In your introduction you must define the clinical factors in line with your study and provide examples. • Looking at your conceptual framework, it appears that AF predicates CHF which is a contradiction to the earlier stated points, see my comments above. • In line 57 provide citations of some of the studies 	<p>We thank the reviewer for the observations made. We respond as below.</p> <p>Agreed, this has been done and now makes better reading.</p> <p>This has been done.</p> <p>Correction has been made.</p> <p>We agree, and it has been done.</p> <p>We agree, it has been done.</p> <p>This has been done</p> <p>We have made this clear in the current wording. The primary diagnosis was CHF.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>that you claim to have been done. This will justify the claim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ref for lines 62-65, I believe these are not your postulates someone must have documented them. So provide the citation(s) • The sentence in line 66, it was.....should be removed as it does not form part of the problem • Defining the clinical factors is essential as it will clearly make the problem less ambiguous to a person not in the medical field. • In section 1.5, this section is totally lacking in information. The authors should clearly state what was done at the different levels of statistical data analysis, models employed and their definitions or how they measure the factors to be considered. • I expect the see how the BMI was computed in the methodology section. • In line 138, he authors write that all significant factors in the univariate logistic regression were considered for entry into the multivariate logistic, I have a big problem here, did they consider the individual effect of a factor on the out? I believe this necessitates the BIVARIATE analysis. Cross tabulations could be handy in this particular case. Otherwise, some important variables may have been excluded which has an overall effect on the authenticity of the reported results or study. • The interpretation of the results from the binary logistic and Multivariate logistic is TOTALLY WRONG. 	<p>This has been done together with a minor correction in grammar. Done</p> <p>Agreed, this has been done.</p> <p>This has been done within the text</p> <p>This section has been incorporated into the general methodology section and specific statistical tests are mentioned in the specific sections where data is reported.</p> <p>Text has now been included to state that $BMI = Wt/Ht^2$</p> <p>This text has all been revised to focus on the main factors investigated and to make easy reading to non-statisticians. We have therefore maintained only frequencies and cross tabulations in our analysis. It is our hope that the text is now clearer and coherent.</p> <p>Agreed, this has been taken care of.</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Line 109, ...admitted the UHT, mind the grammar!• Line 110.....equal number men and women, grammar!• Remove boundaries on the pie-chart• Line 124...modality utilised, check spelling	Corections have been made accordingly.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I COULD NOT PROCEED TO THE DISCUSSION WHEN THE WRONG INTERPRETATION OF THE MODELS IS PRESENTED.• THE AUTHPORS MUST READ ON HOW RESULTS IN THE LOGISTIC MODELS ARE INTERPRETED• DATA ANALYSIS MUST ME REDONE AND THEY MUST USE PROPER STATISTICAL PROCEDURES FOR VARIABLE ELIMINATION.	With the revisions made in most of the manuscript, we hope the reviewer can now proceed to the discussion and beyond.