

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Cardiology Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJCR_123743 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Expert opinion on the clinical use of bisoprolol and telmisartan combination therapy in the management of hypertension in Indian settings |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| <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>"Expert opinion on the clinical use of bisoprolol and telmisartan combination therapy in the management of hypertension in Indian settings" is the topic of discussion in the authors' publication. I was enthralled with this work because non-communicable diseases—especially hypertension—remain a global threat to human health. To guarantee the successful and efficient management of all noncommunicable diseases, more efforts are required. Despite having been conducted in India, this study has global applicability. The results of this study should encourage many doctors to prescribe the telmisartan + bisoprolol combination because it provides superior cardiovascular protection than the telmisartan + metoprolol combination, even though expert opinion is given a low grade in the level of evidence hierarchy. But also, this study would stimulate those doctors to investigate the efficacy and effectiveness of telmisartan + bisoprolol combination in their settings.</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>I possible I advise authors to add one or two background sentences</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>Yes</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>The writers' manuscript is accurate in terms of science. Because the writers pursued this work in accordance with ethical and scientific guidelines, it is robust scientifically. It is clear that when writing this work, the authors put their readers' needs into consideration. They avoided using any scientific jargon. Thus, this work is technically sound.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>Yes</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes | |
| Optional/General comments | The authors' manuscript is very interesting and well written in plain language. It is among the current hot topics. They somehow provided solutions to some difficult problems. Readers will enjoy reading this work | |

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: | Janvier Nzayikorera |
| Department, University & Country | Rwanda |