

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_98748
Title of the Manuscript:	An usual case of congestive cardiac failure
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.journalijr2h.com/index.php/IJR2H/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, this manuscript has the precise study and important for scientific community. Yes, it is suitable title. Yes, Comprehensive. Yes, this manuscript is appropriate level. But not designed properly. Yes, correct. Yes, the references were sufficient regarding the case study. But References were not mentioned properly in the running manuscript. Even the first reference not clear in the reference section. Kindly correct the reference. This is the significant study for the community (author explained the specific case condition {Fanconi anaemia} with multiple disorders).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes, it is suitable for scholarly communications. 2. Kindly point out the proper numbering of pictures in Figure 1.	
Optional/General comments	Some places need proper sentence formation.	

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:	Magesh Sachidanandam
Department, University & Country	King Institute of Preventive Medicine and Research, India