

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_103662
Title of the Manuscript:	Adult onset Still's disease revealed by a cardiac tamponade: 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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/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>Compulsory 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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is of moderate importance for the scientific community. It is a case report describing a patient with Adult onset Still's disease who presented with cardiac tamponade. There is indeed a relatively small number of case reports describing this pathology in the literature (around 10), making this case report a legitimate addition to the scarce body of literature on the topic</p> <p>2. The title is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript follow a logical flow and order expected of a case report.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>7. The suggested corrections to the original manuscript have been marked and proposed in the comments to the original manuscript file. The annotated version of the file is attached to this review form, please provide the authors with both the review form and the annotated manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The quality of the English language should be improved. Corrections have been proposed and are available in the annotated manuscript file attached to this review.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ingrid Prkačin
Department, University & Country	Clinical Hospital Merkur, Croatia