

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_95598
Title of the Manuscript:	A case of Acute on chronic life threatening SVC stenosis managed by timely intervention
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>This is a case report describing the immediate positive outcome of an intervention carried for the superior vena cava obstruction (SVCO) resulting from hemodialysis catheter.</p> <p>The long <b>title</b> indicates the result of the management. The short title is preferred by me.</p> <p>Most of the <b>abstract</b> (2/3<sup>rd</sup>) states about SVCO, and little about the case.</p> <p>However, <b>the text</b> of manuscript has been written well.</p> <p>Some grammatical errors in English writing with spelling mistakes have been observed. An abbreviation used should be made clear when used first in the text.</p> <p>References are inadequate; some statistical results stated in the "<b>Introduction</b>" and "<b>Discussion</b>" sections need references (kindly check whether provided not provided).</p> <p>In the "<b>Discussion</b>" section, the author should have focused on describing some of the relevant studies (catheter related SVC obstruction/stenosis) carried out in the past.</p> <p>To write the "<b>Conclusion</b>" at the end of the text if feasible.</p> <p>The patient needs short and long term follow-up for the recurrence.</p> <p>Recommendation: to revise the manuscript, correct grammatical errors and spelling mistakes, provide adequate references and write the conclusion to improve the standard and quality of the manuscript. Kindly see <b>yellow highlights and comments</b> in the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sheikh Salahuddin Ahmed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Newcastle University Medicine, Malaysia</b>