

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_100424
Title of the Manuscript:	Dilated Cardiomyopathy as a Complication of Severe Hypothyroidism: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case study

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>this manuscript should be minor revision:</p> <p>Q1. It is very important to change and modify the title. the title is not appropriate.</p> <p>Q2. Are the objectives and the rationale of the study clearly stated?</p> <p>Q3. In the abstract, the research gap was not clearly stated. In addition, the authors need to rewrite the study objectives to be more academic writing</p> <p>Q4. In the introduction, include the study's significance. What makes the study different from the rest and what does it add to the current knowledge?.</p> <p>Q5. In the introduction, the authors should have explained the purpose of this study and the existing gaps in this field and explained why this study was conducted.</p> <p>Q6. References are relevant, correct, and not recent. The number of references should be increased. please add some references. since this is a scientific review, all the sentences need to be supported with references.</p> <p>This study is very beautiful. I liked the sequence and enjoyed reading. Please add more references on similar studies.</p> <p>Q7. There are a lot of grammatical errors. This must be taken care of and addressed.</p> <p>Q8. What are the limitations of the study? A description of limitations is missing at the end of the discussion section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<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:	Ali Bader
Department, University & Country	University of Thi-Qar, Iraq