

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research - New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1930
Title of the Manuscript:	Imaging tools for assessment of myocardial fibrosis in humans:the need for greater detail
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This topic of myocardial fibrosis is very necessary to be studied, understood and reviewed by medical personnel, especially those concerned in cardiology and radiology to be able to provide better treatment for patients with myocardial fibrosis cases. Understanding which diagnostic test is better will be able to address better treatment for patients. The level of acuity of each automatic diagnostic test varies from one to another. But each test is addressed according to the needs and cases of the patient. The need to study each test to establish its application for each patient with heart problems and how to address heart surgery to the right person according to its treatment. Finding other methods as a standard for finding the etiology of heart failure is increasingly EMB. The great hope is to find a treatment with minimal invasive procedures. This dream can be achieved through long trials. One thing that needs to be studied is the prospective use of antifibrotics?	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No comment	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No comment	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No comment	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper is very useful for readers because the content is clear, understandable and scientifically useful. The use of clear and good language makes readers understand the author's purpose. The technical understanding of myocardial fibrosis is well described. The systematic writing used by the author is also very good. The sequence of explanations is consistent and in accordance with the flow of writing. The author's explanation does not describe any ambiguity in understanding the writing. The use of clear and credible library sources describes the credibility of the writing. Suggestions need to add more up-to-date library sources to better support the application of the latest technology. But overall, the quality of this paper is very good.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	I suggest to provide more recent references because > 50% reference lists are more than 10 years.	

Review Form2

:		
Minor REVISION comments	No Comment	
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Dior Manta Tambunan
Department, University & Country	Murni Teguh University, Indonesia