

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_111048
Title of the Manuscript:	PROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS OF PATIENTS WITH HEART FAILURE WITH MILDLY REDUCED EJECTION FRACTION- A TERTIARY CARE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is crucial for researchers to provide information for further research activities.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is moderately suitable, even if it needs major correction.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is moderately articulate, even if it needs minor correction.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is poor and needs major modification and correction.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is moderately accepted, but it needs major modification and correction, particularly in the methodology and analysis sections.</p> <p>6. Yes, it is sufficient but needs to be revisited by including recent empirical results.</p> <p>Memo: Please take the comments seriously so that the researcher will revisit the paper in line with the comments to maintain the credibility of the journal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It is less suitable, and it needs a major correction.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	It is essential to revisit the introduction, methodology, analysis methods, and referencing section.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yenehun Taye Engida
Department, University & Country	Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia