

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_96539
Title of the Manuscript:	Top 100 influential articles in the field of Ace inhibitors in preventing cardiac remodeling: A bibliometric analysis
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes, the manuscript is based on published articles on ACE inhibitors that may be used in CHF. 2. Suitable 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Need major revisions in presenting the data 6. Should include more references. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/1060028018779082">https://doi.org/10.1177/1060028018779082</a> <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaip.2017.04.033">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaip.2017.04.033</a> The big table should be given as supplementary file and their summary should be written in manuscript.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Lot of grammatical mistakes, use proper language	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The discussion section should be written precisely to reflect the findings properly.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Monirul Islam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Noakhali Science and Technology University, Bangladesh</b>