

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_98469
Title of the Manuscript:	HYPERTROPHIC CARDIOMYOPATHY MIMICKING ACUTE ANTERIOR MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION : 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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>Yes, because HCM is in differential diagnosis of acute MI that could be life threatening.</p> <p>No. It is a copy of the title of reference 5.</p> <p>No. I think it is better the author mentions more about incompatibility of ECG with HCM.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. The process of writing is not scientific and needs rewriting.</p> <p>NO. There are more relevant references such as "Usefulness of ECG to differentiate apical hypertrophic cardiomyopathy from non-ST elevation acute coronary syndrome"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yirao Tao, " DOI: 10.1016/j.repce.2012.11.022 DOI: 10.4103/jpcs.jpcs_26_21 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>In this case, 1. cardiologist consultation was necessary that did not mention.</p> <p>2. Present ECG interpretation and educational points that help to differentiate acute MI from HCM is crucial in this case.</p> <p>3. Scientific writing is expected to be followed.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fatemeh Rasooli
Department, University & Country	Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran