



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_40335
Title of the Manuscript:	A survey of participants satisfaction of a nurse practitioner-led fast-track outpatient clinic for rhythm and conduction disorder
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)																				
Compulsory REVISION comments	1- Line 7: I suggest making a subtitle for background as first part of the abstract section. 2- Line 38-41: These sentences need citation(s). 3- Line 52: No need for the background subtitle → Please delete. 4- Line 55-60: These sentences need citation(s). 5- Line 64: In another study by Koksvik et al., they → In another study by Koksvik et al. [9] they. 6- Line 67: deterioration of clinical status [9]. → deterioration of clinical status [9]. 7- Line 73: quality of life will be studied → <u>quality of life is studied</u>. 8- Line 88: I suggest making figure (1) in this place to clears data. 9- Line 167: In table (2) → You should make a column for percentage. 10- Line 194: I suggest making figure (4) in this place to clears data. 11- Line 275-277: This part is really a recommendation; Please make a subtitle for recommendation after the conclusion section. 12- In the results section: I can't find the presented figures in the presented tables and figures → I suggest illustrating these results in tables. 13- In the discussion section: I think that this a literature review but not a discussion for your results that not illustrated in the manuscript.	1- Line 7: I suggest making a subtitle for background as first part of the abstract section: The suggestion has been taken. Background: Nurse-led outpatient clinics for acute and chronic disorders are increasingly growing but data on nurse-led fast-track clinic for rhythm and/or conduction disorders (FT-RCD) are lacking. 2- Line 38-41: These sentences need citation(s). [1,2,3,4]. 3- Line 52: No need for the background subtitle → Please delete. Subtitle is deleted. 4- Line 55-60: These sentences need citation(s). [5,6,7]. 5- Line 64: In another study by Koksvik et al., they → In another study by Koksvik et al. [9] they. Changes have been made. 6- Line 67: deterioration of clinical status [9]. → deterioration of clinical status [9]. Changes have been made. 7- Line 73: quality of life will be studied → <u>quality of life is studied</u>. Alteration has been made. 8- Line 88: I suggest making figure (1) in this place to clears data. Figure (1) is added. 9- Line 167: In table (2) → You should make a column for percentage. A column for percentage is added. 10- Line 194: I suggest making figure (4) in this place to clears data. Figure (4) is added 11- Line 275-277: This part is really a recommendation; Please make a subtitle for recommendation after the conclusion section. A subtitle for recommendation after the conclusion section is made. Recommendation: Further studies for analysis of cost effectiveness, satisfaction of specialist physician related to release of the work load may be needed. 12- In the results section: I can't find the presented figures in the presented tables and figures → I suggest illustrating these results in tables. (Table 2): <table><tr><th></th><th>Normal (%)</th><th>Abnormal (%)</th><th>Equivocal (%)</th></tr><tr><td>Exercise tolerance testing</td><td>78.4</td><td>12.2</td><td>9.4</td></tr><tr><td>Echocardiogram</td><td>78.5</td><td>21.5</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>X-thorax</td><td>78.5</td><td>21.5</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>Ambulatory Holter monitoring</td><td>99.9</td><td>0.1</td><td>-</td></tr></table> 13- In the discussion section: I think that this a literature review but not a discussion for your results that not illustrated in the manuscript: Our study is the first to demonstrate		Normal (%)	Abnormal (%)	Equivocal (%)	Exercise tolerance testing	78.4	12.2	9.4	Echocardiogram	78.5	21.5	-	X-thorax	78.5	21.5	-	Ambulatory Holter monitoring	99.9	0.1	-
	Normal (%)	Abnormal (%)	Equivocal (%)																			
Exercise tolerance testing	78.4	12.2	9.4																			
Echocardiogram	78.5	21.5	-																			
X-thorax	78.5	21.5	-																			
Ambulatory Holter monitoring	99.9	0.1	-																			



SDI Review Form 1.6

		that nurse-led fast track out-patient clinics significantly reduces the diagnostic interval with good-excellent participants satisfaction. . Considering patient satisfaction with nurse-led clinic of oncology care, patient satisfaction was stable over time. More than 90% rated the nurse practitioner as good, the waiting time as acceptable and the length of appointment as sufficient [10]. Recently, in a systematic review, Randall et al., emphasized a positive (subjective and objective) patient satisfaction of nurse-led clinics in comparison with physician-led clinics [11]. The results of future studies are awaited. Indeed a literature review of current nurse-led clinics is given.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-----	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1- When you use an abbreviation you should mention the full term at the first time. 2- Please follow the system of the journal in writing the references in the manuscript; text and list of references. 3- Please follow my comments all over the manuscript.	1- All abbreviations have been checked and corrected. 2- These recommendations have been followed. 3- All comments have been followed as suggested.