

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_123316
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Correlation of the antihypertensive drugs with the type of stroke in elderly patients.</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript is of great importance both for the scientific community and for the general population, given that stroke is a disease with high incidence and prevalence, being one of the main causes of disability and mortality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The article is very good, with potential for publication. Well written, but authors should use more current references, preferably from the last five years. They should also use more bibliographic references, as the number of references is insufficient. Stroke is a disease that has numerous current publications, as it is a serious public health problem. Furthermore, I also suggest that the authors improve the discussion as it is very poor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are insufficient and very old. I suggest searching the Clarivate databases; Web of Science; ScienceDirect; Wiley; SpringerLink; Taylor and Francis; PubMed; among others	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The article has potential for publication, but the authors must enrich the bibliographic references, update the references with studies from the last five years and improve the discussion, which is very poor.	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Cristianne Confessor Castilho Lopes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of the Joinville Region, Brazil</b>