

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_92436
Title of the Manuscript:	GIANT CORONARY ARTERY ECTASIA PRESENTING WITH ST ELEVATION MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The title does not reflect the basic objective of the article. Since the key issue is the lack of standardization of anti-coagulation treatment for patients with high thrombus burden in the setting of a giant coronary artery ectasia, the title should mention this issue.</p> <p>In the discussion, the authors should offer their advice for treating the specified patient population and anti-coagulants. They outline various approaches, but offer no conclusion as to what pharmacologic regimen is best</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In the introduction, there should be a clear, concise statement of the purpose of the article. Why are the authors presenting the case history and what is the objective of this presentation?</p> <p>A few grammatical and sentence structure errors in the Abstract and Case Presentation.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The brief article is interesting and attracts interest, but lessons learned from the Case History and brief review of findings from current literature are not focused into a clinically useful concept.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeffrey H Dwyer
Department, University & Country	Kaiser Permanente Medical Center, United States