

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_129107
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of Cardiogenic Shock in Intensive Care: A Case Series Analysis
Type of the Article	Case report

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript aims to provide some guidelines regarding the management of cardiogenic shock by analysing 12 patients' data from the ICU of CHU Ibn Rochd hospital in Casablanca, Morocco. The authors emphasized the importance of managing cardiogenic shock to improve patient health and reduce mortality which is over 50%. The authors also hope that therapeutic strategies and early detection can reduce mortality risk.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title could be "Management of Cardiogenic Shock in Intensive Care Unit (ICU) : A Case Series Analysis" instead of "Management of Cardiogenic Shock in Intensive Care: A Case Series Analysis"	
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.	I am not sure why the abstract contained all the section summaries. It could just be one paragraph summarizing those sections, if that's what the authors intended to do.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Only 12 patients were analysed which is not sufficient for any kind of generalization. If there is any specific reason for this, the authors should mention it. Also, a thorough analysis of the data collection and analysis process should be documented and backed by current best practices as mentioned in the literature. Figure 1 and 2 legends are not in English which is not acceptable. Hemodynamic characteristics include all medians except for one mean. Discussion section should be related to the analysis presented, not general overviews. This section could be a part of literature review / background.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References should be formatted correctly. Some references have incomplete journal name which is not a usual practice.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The authors should provide the full forms of these abbreviations: LVEF, LTI and many others during their first use in a paragraph.	
Optional/General comments	The article needs major revision and cannot be accepted in its current form.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Adib Uz Zaman
Department, University & Country	School of Information Technology, University of Cincinnati, USA