

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>
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.	An interesting study on opinions conducted on physicians based on choice of treatment of hypertension. However, I have a few suspicions. Is the researcher trying to push his agenda by favouring this fixed drug combination? It's well written but there are many deficiencies in the conduct of the study and the description of the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Major points 1. The methods state that a 19 point questionnaire was used for the study. Please enumerate the questions in the form of a chart or a graph Highlighting the response. 2. This article does not give a balanced view of the opinions of the physicians involved in the study. 3. Participants: this has not been clearly defined. What was the educational qualification of the participants? What was their demographic profile? How many years of experience did they have? What was their specialization? 4. This study was based on the treatment of hypertension. What was the definition of hypertension as treated by the physician? What classification did they use to label a patient as hypertensive? Did they treat Pre hypertension, stage 1 hypertension or stage 2 hypertension? 5. This is an analysis of expert opinion. But the use of statistics is not well defined; Descriptive statistics, such as mean, median, mode, standard deviation, or frequency, can be used to summarize the distribution and variation of expert opinions on different aspects. Inferential statistics like correlation, regression, ANOVA, or chi-square can be used to test hypotheses or explore relationships between expert opinions and other variables. None of these have been mentioned in the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes but needs to be in Vancouver style	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Minor points: 1. Paragraph 5 in discussion. The drugs have been shown to reduce cardiovascular risk. Cardiovascular risk here is not defined. Conclusion.	

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:	Sharath Krishnaswami
Department, University & Country	Paras Hospitals, India