

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_112047</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Sodium-Glucose Cotransporter-2 (SGLT2) Inhibitors for Acute Heart Failure: A Systematic Review</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent?</b></p> <p><b>7. If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1- The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it offers novel insights into the use of SGLT2 inhibitors in acute heart failure, filling a research gap and suggesting avenues for further investigation.</p> <p>2- Yes, the title of the article, "Sodium-Glucose Cotransporter-2 (SGLT2) Inhibitors for Acute Heart Failure: A Systematic Review," is suitable as it clearly and accurately reflects the content, indicating the focus on SGLT2 inhibitors in the context of acute heart failure and the systematic review methodology employed. <b>"SGLT2 Inhibitors in Acute Heart Failure: A Comprehensive Systematic Review of Cardiovascular Outcomes and Clinical Efficacy."</b></p> <p>3- The abstract, while generally comprehensive, would benefit from a more explicit clarification of the temporal context of included studies, and disclosure of considerations regarding heterogeneity for a more nuanced understanding of the systematic review's methodology and findings.</p> <p>4- While the manuscript's structure is generally well-organized, a more detailed critical view could involve providing additional context on the potential limitations of the included studies and offering insights into how the systematic review addresses and mitigates these limitations for a more nuanced interpretation of the findings.</p> <p>5- The references in the manuscript are generally appropriate, encompassing a variety of study types, including systematic reviews, clinical trials, and observational studies. However, a more detailed critical view might involve ensuring a comprehensive coverage of the literature by exploring additional databases or journals, especially considering the dynamic nature of the field. Additionally, it could be beneficial to explicitly state the criteria for reference inclusion and exclusion to enhance transparency in the selection process. The use of recent references is commendable, but a balance with seminal works should be maintained for a comprehensive overview.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Based on the provided text, the language and English quality of the article seem to be suitable for scholarly communications. The text is well-written, clear, and follows standard conventions of academic writing. The use of terminology is appropriate, and the sentences are structured coherently, facilitating effective communication of scientific information.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kamran Azadbakht</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lorestan University of Medical Science, Iran</b>