

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_96321
Title of the Manuscript:	An infective endocarditis revealed by an acute myocardial infarction : a 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.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> <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>1. The manuscript is moderately important for the scientific community as an interesting example of recurrent infective mitral valve endocarditis in an otherwise healthy middle-aged patient.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable. I suggest changing it to: "Infective endocarditis revealed by an acute myocardial infarction : a case report" for simplicity's sake.</p> <p>3. The abstract is informative, however I suggest reformatting it to fit the usual "Introduction, Case Presentation, Discussion, Conclusion" case report format for the sake of comprehensiveness. The English quality should also be improved and the abstract (along with the rest of the paper) should be corrected linguistically by an expert certified in Medical English editing.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>7. The discussion should be expanded to elaborate and review the current guidelines, research and opinions regarding surgical versus conservative management of infective endocarditis and the criteria on which the decision is based, followed by a short discussion on where the patient described in this case report would fit based on those criteria and research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The English quality should be improved and the paper should be corrected linguistically by an expert certified in Medical English editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

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