

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77128
Title of the Manuscript:	RISK FACTORS OF HEART FAILURE AMONG THE PATIENTS OF HYPERTENSION ATTENDING A HOSPITAL IN ISLAMABAD, PAKISTAN: THE RISKS OF HYPERTENSIVE HEART FAILURE A CASE-CONTROL STUDY
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the article. But I think there are some shortcomings in the article. These;</p> <p>1- the title of the article is too long, it can be shortened</p> <p>2- Abstract: a- It is not appropriate to give numbers as both numbers and text. Sample; Like a hundred (100). b- Using p=0.01 instead of p-value c- Rearrangement of keywords; "high blood pressure = hypertension" are words used interchangeably.</p> <p>3- Introduction: Too long and broken, should be shortened</p> <p>4-Method; * 18 years and over are taken when working on adults. Why 28 years old and above? * How were the groups determined? *Inclusion and rejection criteria are written but difficult to understand. It should be written more simply and clearly. * How the diagnosis of heart failure was used. The term myocardial failure is used in the keywords, what is the definition of this condition? * There is no information about the use of statistics. What tests were used? * Mean age and range of all patients (minimum and maximum)</p> <p>5- Why is there no p value in the results? 6- What abbreviations should be explained under the table? 7-References should be written in a uniform manner.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>1-There are many bad grammatical errors in the text series.</p> <p>2- One of the gold standards for the diagnosis of heart failure is echography. Why was echography never used?</p> <p>3- The mean age in heart failure is generally higher than in the study. What is the reason for low age in the study?</p>	

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:	Abuzer Coskun
Department, University & Country	Istanbul Bagcilar Training and Research Hospital, Turkey