



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_50041
Title of the Manuscript:	Drugs Used in Thromboembolic Disorders: An Insight Into Their Mechanisms
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>Drugs Used in Thromboembolic Disorders: An Insight Into Their Mechanisms</p> <p>It was a pleasure for me to review this paper.</p> <p>I read through this manuscript and I think that could be acceptable if some aspects are clarified. The subject is interesting and important.</p> <p>I congratulate the author.</p> <p>I suggest that, please, the authors check the following comments:</p> <p>Two different types of literature review research are available: systematic review and non-systematic review or narrative review (update). The traditional method of integration in the literature has been the narrative review, but it has two basic weaknesses. First, there is no rule on how to get primary data, and how to integrate results; that is the subjective criterion of the reviewer. Second, the narrative reviewer does not quantitatively synthesize the data found in the different publications; therefore, these revisions are very susceptible to inaccuracies and biases.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Noted</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		