

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_95018
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnostic wandering in a therapeutic emergency: A case study of an AL cardiac amyloidosis mimicking tuberculosis
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>The case described in the article is really interesting and the discussion is very meaningful. I think this article is relevant for publication.</b> 2. <b>The title of article is suitable.</b> 3. <b>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</b> 4. <b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</b> 5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically appropriate.</b> 6. <b>The references are sufficient and recent.</b>  The language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	Simone Collura
Department, University & Country	University of Brescia, Italy