

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2335
Title of the Manuscript:	The Polypill: A New Alternative In The Prevention And Treatment Of Cardiovascular Disease
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The present study explores the potential of the Polypill to improve adherence and reduce the global burden of cardiovascular disease (CVD). It offers valuable insights into the Polypill's impact on managing hypertension and hyperlipidemia, particularly in low-income countries, and provides a thorough analysis that could inspire further research and clinical advancements in CVD prevention and treatment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it clearly reflects the focus of the manuscript on the Polypill as a novel approach to cardiovascular disease (CVD) management.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but it could be enhanced. please see the following suggestions: 1- Clearly state the objective of the review in the opening sentence to frame the context better. 2- Briefly mention some key findings or conclusions from the reviewed clinical trials to provide a snapshot of the manuscript's contributions 3- Highlight the broader implications of these findings for global health, particularly in low- and middle-income countries.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate for the content.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, providing a thorough review of the Polypill's impact on cardiovascular disease through an evaluation of clinical trials and recent research. Its comprehensive analysis of fixed-dose combinations and clear structure underscore its credibility and relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references provided appear to be relevant and comprehensive for a manuscript on the Polypill and cardiovascular disease. They include key guidelines, recent updates, foundational studies, and cost-effectiveness analyses that are pertinent to the topic.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and quality of English in the article are appropriate for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, professional, and conforms to academic standards.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mohammad Ali Hosseini
Department, University & Country	Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Iran