Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_124070**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effectiveness of SGLT2 Inhibitors in Reducing Cardiovascular Mortality in Heart Failure: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis**
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 important systemic review and meta-analysis confirms the claims of isolated reports on the benefits of SGLT2 inhibitors on morbidity and mortality in heart failure patients – a disease with still dismal 5-year survival.**	
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.	**Second sentence in the abstract needs to be re-written, "Although pharmacotherapy……..due to cardiovascular disease".**	
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.	**The study is well done. The results are reliable. Will add to the scientific knowledge regarding practical approach to HF patients.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**Yes**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Certain acronyms/abbreviations, for example HFrEF, HfpEF, MRAs, SGLT2 and T2DM need to be properly listed and spelled out during their first appearance in the manuscript. The 'F' is capital in HFrEF and lower case in HfpEF.	
Optional/General comments	Minor changes otherwise a study well done.	

Review Form 3

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Shashi Agarwal**
Department, University & Country	**USA**