

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_94041
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Ayurveda-based diet and panchakarma therapy on quantitative change in coronary atherosclerosis in known CAD assessed by quantitative CT Coronary angiography.
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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For all written claims there must be a source - a reference. - It should be stated which research has been done on this topic so far and on which population. - The last sentence is actually the goal of the research, not to write that the study was designed... It should be written: Therefore, the goal of this study is to evaluate..... <p>Method</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State the number of men and women monitored during 90 days and their ages. <p>The results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The data from the first paragraph should be found in the Method - In Table 1, add a special column for the level of statistical significance Sig or p, as well as below before and after treatment to refer to mean values. - See if all abbreviations have been added to the legend below the table. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In this part, it is written from the goal of the research, which is broken down from details to the general (like a pyramid). - All results obtained in the Discussion should be explained, compared with possibly the same or similar results, and a mini-conclusion and recommendation should be given. 	
Minor REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	<p>General conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The study is well designed, only the next studies should include many more subjects even though this is a case study. I think that based on such a small number of respondents, it is not possible to draw concrete conclusions and guarantee that this is the case for everyone. Due to the age range and the small number of days for which the respondents were monitored.- This is a recommendation for further research in order to expand the topic.- Also, more details could have been written about the treatment and diet and to give a better picture of what the patients did during the research. <p>Correct the study according to the above suggestions. There is no need to send me for revision again, but only for the above to be corrected and accepted for publication</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Milan Zelenovic
Department, University & Country	University of East Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina