

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_96178
Title of the Manuscript:	PERICARDIAL EFFUSION ASSOCIATED WITH LEFT VENTRICULAR HYPERTROPHY AND MACROPHAGE ACTIVATION SYNDROME REVEALING SYSTEMIC LUPUS ERYTHEMATOSUS: A CASE REPORT
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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b>  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. 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>	<b>1. This manuscript is important for scientific community.</b> <b>2. The title of the article is suitable.</b> <b>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</b> <b>4. The structure and the subsections are appropriate.</b> <b>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b> <b>6. References are sufficient and recent.</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	English quality is not suitable for scholarly communications. I suggest a minor grammar revision.	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>		

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Simone Collura
Department, University & Country	University of Brescia, Italy