

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_84289
Title of the Manuscript:	IVABRADINE - MANAGEMENT OF HEART FAILURE (SYSTEMATIC REVIEW)
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	After a slow and critical reading of the present work, I would like to comment that, in my opinion, it is a very interesting review, and although it is always possible to increase the information in this type of article, I think that in its form and current content could be accepted for publication. Heart failure is one of the major cardiovascular problem and poor self-care may lead to adverse cardiovascular events in these patients. The article aims to summarize the effect of ivabradine on coronary artery disease and heart failure compared with placebo or standard care via clinical trials or meta-analysis. It is a well-structured article, very interesting and the results are presented in an appropriate manner, being clear and transparent. I consider that the study is valuable and sound and can be published after some minor revisions. I recommend to highlight the original aspects of their study and address the future scope and topics that are important and that could not be covered in the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	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:	Larisa Anghel
Department, University & Country	“Grigore T. Popa” University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania