

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_98794
Title of the Manuscript:	Libman-Sacks Endocarditis as the first manifestation of Systemic Lupus Erythematosus : a case report .
Type of the Article	Case report

### 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>	<p>Of course not a unique one hence the management strategy of this rare entity can be publishable according to the journals policy.</p> <p>The title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is sufficient, although it may mislead readers as LSE can be diagnosed only by echocardiography.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Scientifically correct but presentation of the case should be more algorithmic and formal.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and can be more recent ones.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Professional English language edition should perform for the entire text.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Here is my suggestions for a friendly review, While presenting this interesting and rare case, the authors should focus on a multidisciplinary approach and should make the management of the patient more formally in an algorithmic manner and compatible with the format of writing a scientific article, by emphasizing that the diagnosis cannot be made with echocardiogram alone. Also the gender of the case is confusing ( he/she) ...	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Baris Akca</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Inonu University, Turkey</b>