

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJCR_98109</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>IS THERE AN ELECTRO-ANGIOGRAPHIC CORRELATION IN VD INFARCTION?</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>ORIGINALITY: (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does the paper clearly point out differences from related research? Yes</li> <li>- Are the problems or approaches new? yes</li> </ul> <p>For example, does the paper: address a new problem or one that has not been studied in much depth? yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>introduce an interesting research paradigm? yes</li> <li>introduce an area that appears promising, or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives? yes</li> </ul> <p>SIGNIFICANCE (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the work important? yes</li> <li>- Does it advance the state of the art? yes</li> <li>- Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view? yes</li> </ul> <p>TECHNICAL QUALITY (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the paper technically sound, with compelling arguments? yes</li> <li>- Is there a careful evaluation? Does the paper carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? yes</li> <li>- Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well known technique? yes</li> <li>- If the paper describes an application, is there: a clear and compelling motivation for why the chosen approach is important? a careful description of the design and implementation of the system? a thorough evaluation of the system with respect to a clearly-stated set of functional and quality requirements? yes</li> </ul> <p>QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the paper clearly written? yes</li> <li>- Does the paper motivate the research? yes</li> <li>- Are results clearly described and evaluated? yes</li> <li>- Is the paper well organized? yes</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>This paper proposes the <b>IS THERE AN ELECTRO-ANGIOGRAPHIC CORRELATION IN VD INFARCTION?</b></p> <p>I have some recommendations and remarks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- What interests your work,</li> <li>2- Try to show more experiences results for each topic</li> <li>3- Use and study other recent methods.</li> <li>4. you should include the section references.</li> <li>5. The paper needs revisions; the second round of major revisions is needed, both concerning the structure and content of the paper.</li> <li>6. The approach section (which describes the approach) is very brief, the work of the authors should be well detailed and clearly presented.</li> <li>7. if it is possible to add a section where you cite related works and give background information</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Yousef Farhaoui</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Moulay Ismail University, Morocco</b>