

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_98258
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Development of an MRI Compatible Circuit suitable for Pre-Clinical Physiological Monitoring in a 4.7T Magnetic Resonance Imaging.
Type of the 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.journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	I think it need more revised or major revised to can say scientific paper Yes no no No, it should be new arrange and modify again with high quality modify I do not have any suggest references because introduction not arrange correctly	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Med	
Optional/General comments	Yes but with high and major revised Reviewer's comment 1- Authors must be removed any reference from abstract 2- The references cited in introduction not enough 3- The discussion not enough for each figures 4- The conclusion is missing in paper	

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hamed A. Gatea
Department, University & Country	Iraq