

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_104995
Title of the Manuscript:	The Spectrum of Echocardiographic Abnormalities Among Referral Patients in A Tertiary Cardiac Hospital in Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>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. I believe that this manuscript is of importance to the scientific community. The study detailed in the manuscript delves into echocardiographic abnormalities among referral patients in a tertiary cardiac hospital in Bangladesh. This contributes to our understanding of the frequency and types of cardiovascular diseases in the region, especially the common echocardiographic abnormalities among these patients. 2. The title is clear, concise, and informative, providing potential readers with a good initial understanding of what the study is about. Therefore, it is suitable for the manuscript. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is quite comprehensive. It provides a good summary of the study including its background, aim, methods, key findings, and conclusion. 4. Yes, the structure of the manuscript appears to be appropriately organized. The manuscript also includes keywords for indexing and figures, which are standard components of scientific articles. On the whole, the manuscript adheres to the standard structure for academic research articles in the field of medical science. 5. The study appears to follow standard scientific methodology, including a clear aim, appropriate methodology, and well-documented results. The study uses accepted tools like echocardiography in a relevant setting, and collects and analyzes data in a systematic way. The manuscript should ideally be reviewed by qualified peers in the field for a comprehensive evaluation. 6. we can see that the article cites a variety of sources, including academic journal articles, reports from the World Health Organization, and relevant regulations. These references cover a range of topics, including the epidemiology of congenital heart disease, ethical principles for medical research, and data protection regulations. From the reference list, the references in this article seem to be sufficient. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is generally suitable for scholarly communications, a careful editing pass would improve the clarity and readability of the article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Here are some general comments for the document:</p> <p>Abstract: You have provided a concise and clear summary of the research topic, the methods, and the key findings of the study. It is helpful that you've mentioned the most frequent echocardiographic abnormalities found in the study population.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction provides sufficient background on the importance of echocardiography and its role in diagnosing cardiovascular diseases (CVDs). The use of references to support the information presented is commendable.</p> <p>Methodology: The methodology section is detailed and gives a clear picture of how the research was conducted. The inclusion of the information about the ethical considerations and consent is appreciated.</p> <p>Results: You have provided a detailed account of the findings in this section. The use of both descriptive and inferential statistics to present the findings is well-done. It might be beneficial to include some visual representations of the data, such as graphs or charts, to enhance comprehension.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Tables and Figures: The tables and figures included in the paper are well organized. They enhance the understanding of the demographic characteristics and findings of the study. Make sure to add captions for the figures and tables in the final manuscript.</p> <p>Usage of Terminology: The paper uses appropriate medical and scientific terminology, which is suitable for a specialized audience. However, it could be beneficial to provide brief explanations or definitions for some terms to make it more accessible to readers from different backgrounds.</p> <p>Writing Style: The writing style is clear, concise, and objective. The tone is appropriate for a scientific research article.</p> <p>Lastly, please make sure to include the remaining sections such as discussion, conclusion, and references in the final manuscript. A discussion section will help readers understand the implications of your findings, and a conclusion will summarize the key points of your research. A references section is also essential for validating the information and assertions made in the article.</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:	leong Chon Man
Department, University & Country	Conde de São Januário Hospital, China