

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_84235
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Sodium Glucose Co-Transporter-2 Inhibitors in Heart Failure Patients
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalijrc.com/index.php/AJRCD/editorial-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>Dear author please</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract section, give a little more explanation about the purpose of the study 2. Study Design and Place and Duration of the Study are parts of the method, there is no need to separate these two parts. Please correct it. For example; this study is Prospective observational that done at Department of Cardiology, Princess Esra Hospital, Telangana, Hyderabad, from August 2020 to January 2022... 3. Please write the code of ethics of this study in the method section 4. Tables should be placed in the results section, not in the discussion section 5. In Tables 2 and 3, specify the time period before and after the variable was recorded 6. This part in the discussion "In this study a total of 100 patients admitted in the cardiology department of the hospital during the duration of 6 months i.e. from August 2020 to January 2021 were assessed. Out of which 11 subjects were excluded from the study due to incomplete data and 5 were excluded as they did not meet the inclusion criteria. Hence 84 patients who met the inclusion criteria were followed up for 1 year and were included in the study, these HF patients were then categorised into two groups..." is replaced to the beginning of the result 7. The discussion of an article should explain the results obtained and in it should avoid giving numbers and figures and P-Valuo (because they are mentioned in the results section). He also reviewed and compared the results of the study with the results of other researchers. Please observe this and correct that. 8. The conclusion should include the main purpose of your study (what you mentioned in the title). Avoid giving additional explanations and re-describing the work. 9. Research limitations should be at the end of the study 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We would like to inform the reviewer that the abstract indicates the gist of our study and we have explained that the aim of the study was to understand the effect that SGLT2i would have when added to conventional therapy and also in presence or absence of diabetes. 2. The manuscript has been revised in response to the reviewer's suggestions [2,3,4,5,6,7,8]. 3. All the table headings have been highlighted in the results section as they have all been shifted to that section. 4. The discussion and conclusion of the article have also been corrected. <p>All numbers, figures and p-values have been removed from the discussion section.[line no-42 potassium and chloride; line no-45 blood urea and serum creatinine investigated in Group-II (serum creatinine for line no 47 non-diabetics; line no 58 Group-I and line no 59 Group- II at admission and discharge this was also observed for both line no-60 diabetics and line no 61 non-diabetics; line no 79 Group-I and Group- II; line no 82 diabetics as well as non-diabetics; line no 117 NYHA class, reduced line no 118 rehospitalisation and decrease in line no 119 mortality was observed in case of patients taking SGLT2-inhibitors, although there was no statistical significance observed. The effect of SGLT2i on the primary outcome was consistent in patients regardless of the presence or absence of diabetes. In group II, when diabetic and non-diabetic patients with HF receiving SGLT2 inhibitor were compared both of them also indicated improvements in line no-129 NYHA class, reduced rehospitalisation and decrease in line no-130 mortality]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The research limitation have been placed at the end of the conclusion and the heading has been highlighted. 6. All the corrections asked by the reviewer have been made.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	It is suggested that Table 5 be given in the form of a comparison chart for a better and faster understanding of the reader	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	