

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_98867
Title of the Manuscript:	Eisenmenger Syndrome with Dextrocardia, Ectopic Left Kidney and Right side Scoliosis: A Rare Case Report
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 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 Not properly better to reframe if possible. Is scoliosis from birth or acquired? Yes, but as it is the most common syndrome, better to mention the uniqueness like scoliosis. YES, but better to expand the introduction and add at-least one reference Yes, but better to do a genetic test /or classification by OMIM/ICD10. Better to add birth history and family history. Yes Consent ,ethical issues, follow up of the patient better to mention. Key words are better to add in MeSH terms in alphabetical order which are not in the title. Images better to site in the manuscript. In introduction, if possible, add uniqueness. Newer therapies are better to add.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not suitable ,better to improve.	
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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Kotha
Department, University & Country	Osmania University, India