

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_109040
Title of the Manuscript:	Tetralogy of Fallot with Total Anomalous Pulmonary Venous Connection: a rare variant
Type of the Article	Case study

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The authors have reported a rare case in congenital heart disease which combines TOF with TAPVC. Given the rarity of the disease, I believe reporting this case would add to the existing literature to advance the field of congenital heart disease. However, the authors only diagnosed the disease and they referred to the cardiothoracic surgery department for early surgery. No mention about the surgery itself. Were their findings corroborated by the surgical team? How and when did the child undergo surgery? How was his intraoperative and postoperative course? Because the readers would like to know the final outcome of this case, I strongly suggest that the authors include the whole course of this case until the child is discharged home. This current form includes only half of the story. There are several grammatical issues with the manuscript, please consider correcting them and thorough proofreading.</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? No. It needs to be re-written avoiding extra length which is not included in the main body. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. No. The references come from 2008 and prior. I would like the authors to search for relevant recent references (I am sure there are many).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	I suggest the authors make a serious major revision.	

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:	Nirmal Panthee
Department, University & Country	Shahid Gangalal National Heart Center, National Academy of Medical Sciences, Nepal