

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_103741
Title of the Manuscript:	CHOLESTATIC BRADYCARDIA: THE STORY OF RISING BILIRUBIN AND THE SLOWING HEART – A CASE REPORT OF A 74 YEARS OLD FEMALE PATIENT AT UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA TEACHING HOSPITAL, ENUGU, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Case report

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.journalijrc.com/index.php/AJRCD/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Write the structure of the abstract based on the case report, not the original article. 2. Write the serial number of the references in cursive. 3. The numbering of the graph should be below it, and the explanation of the graph should be written below it. 4. The article is well structured and coherent. 5. It is confirmed in terms of scientific content. 6. References are relatively good, but old references are used a lot. It would be great if you could add similar articles to the discussion section for comparison and analysis 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Motahareh Ghodrati
Department, University & Country	Qom University of Medical Sciences, Iran