

Your review report

Manuscript

Assessment of Electrocardiogram Interpretation Competency among Health Professional staff and Students of Ardabil University of Medical Sciences: A Multidisciplinary Study

Feedback for the author(s)

Comments to the author(s)

Thank you for this opportunity to review. This manuscript reports the ECG interpretation competency of staff and students within a medical sciences institution in Iran. The sample size used is sufficient to determine statistically measured associations and the ECG interpretation tool is validated in other peer reviewed publications. I offer some grammatical edits as tracked changes throughout the submitted document to assist with English language dissemination.

Please find some recommendations to this version of the manuscript:

- 1 - Incorporating pedagogical approaches used for ECG interpretation is recommended as an intention of this manuscript is to determine factors of ECG interpretation competency. This should occur in the background and discussion sections of the manuscript.
- 2 - Elaborate on how participants were recruited to the study, particularly outline how coercion and bias were mitigated across faculty and student participants.
- 3 - Adopt phrases and use them consistently throughout the manuscript for clarity, for example "ST elevation MI" as opposed to "MI" and "pathological Q waves" as opposed to "pathological Q".
- 4 - The term "professional education" to describe the cohorts profession is confusing in the initial statements of the manuscript, could you rephrase this term better, perhaps "job title" or "career"?
- 5 - You could enhance within the discussion point more by addressing the teaching, learning and assessment models used for ECG interpretation. Also you could consider poor ECG interpretation linked to computer aided diagnosis, a focus on medical imaging as opposed to electrophysiology and limitations in ECG recording reliability (the impact of posture, lead position and patient habitus).

Perhaps the following publication could be useful to you available here https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0022073618306411?dgcid=raven_sd_aip_email

Confidential feedback for the Editor

Your recommendation

- **Revise**

Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question (including the use of appropriate controls), and are the conclusions supported by the evidence presented?

- **Yes**

Are the methods sufficiently described to allow the study to be repeated?

- **Yes**

Is the use of statistics and treatment of uncertainties appropriate?

- **Yes**

Is the presentation of the work clear?

- ***No, it needs some language corrections before being published***

Comments

There are some typos and grammatical errors throughout. I can attach my amendments if helpful.

Are the images in this manuscript (including electrophoretic gels and blots) free from apparent manipulation?

- ***I am not able to assess this***

Comments

There are no images

Confidential comments to the Editor