

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_95281
Title of the Manuscript:	Rare case of syphilitic aortitis
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Review: This is an interesting paper worth publishing. However there are a few corrections required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract section the authors write The clinical evolution under monitored penicillin therapy and specific treatment of heart failure was favorable. While in the Observation section they mention an operative strategy. Be consistent. 2. In the observation section Para 1 the authors write On this picture, edemas of the lower limbs were grafted, hence her hospitalization in cardiology for global cardiac decompensation. Edemas of the lower limbs were grafted? Not clear. Clarify the same. 3. In the observation section Para 3 its not Mussets sign. It is de Mussets sign. 4. In the observation section Para 4 they write suggesting a syphilitic gum. It is syphilitic gummata 5. Figure 1: skin lesions showing syphilitic gum on the back should be Skin lesions showing syphilitic gummata 6. Figure 3: electrocardiogram showed electrical LVH should be Electrocardiogram showed electrical LVH 7. Figure 4 is a 3D image and should be mentioned. Figure 4: Aortic insufficiency on 3D transthoracic ultrasound 8. Figure 5 : BENTALL Procedure should be Bentall procedure 9. In discussion they say The absence of coronary angiography in our context did not allow a verification of the coronary status, while in observation they say Preoperative coronary angiography was normal. Which is correct? 10. Referring to the half-pressure time, the IAo of our patient is significant. Its pressure-half time and all abbreviations (like IAo, AI) should be expanded 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<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:	George Thomas
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi Co-operative Hospital, India