

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_125576
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of Hemodynamic Events During the Implementation of a Novel Indigenous Tele ICU system-An Observational Study
Type of the Article	Review Article , Case study

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant role for the scientific community as it presents review for understanding of its subject matter. It provides an analysis of current issues, findings and methodologies that could stimulate further research and application in the field. I appreciate the manuscript, review and its impact in addressing gaps in the literature. However, there are many areas for improvement in terms of data interpretation or further exploration of real-world implications.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract should be more clear regarding the review and case study. Methodology can be change different according to the cases. Missing of the method and propose system</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Not proper in format</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript not up to the mark for technical review. Methodology and proposed system is missing.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Should include more reference</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Begin by appreciating the author's effort and acknowledging the strengths of the paper. Highlight aspects you found interesting or well-executed, such as originality, clarity, or depth of research.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be clear and specific about areas where the paper could improve. Focus on the content, methodology, data interpretation, or clarity of writing. • Avoid vague comments like "the paper needs more work." Instead, provide actionable suggestions • If there are problems with the research design, data collection, or analysis, clearly state them and suggest possible solutions. • Be sure to explain why certain methodological choices may affect the validity or reliability of the results. • paper is unclear or difficult to follow, mention specific sections that need improvement 	

Review Form 3

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:	Lowlesh Nandkishor Yadav
Department, University & Country	Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Technological University, India