

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_99242
Title of the Manuscript:	Spontaneous coronary dissection revealed by ventricular tachycardia in a female patient: A case report and review of literature
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.journalajcrmh.com/index.php/AJCRMH/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The issue is not original and reliable for scientific publication: spontaneous coronary dissection has already studied and evaluated in many articles (5/10).</p> <p>2. Fair (5/10)</p> <p>3. Enough (5/10)</p> <p>4. Yes (7/10)</p> <p>5. Yes (6/10), in my opinion it needs some improvement to be more suitable and original.</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Some tapping mistake to be correct</p> <p>2. English is fair</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I think the spontaneous coronary dissection in female gender is an important and inquisitee issue but the scientific literature is full of related article. I suggest to the author to improve the data and the manuscript structure to be more original and increase its peculiarity to be competitive in scientific literature.</p> <p>For instance: more data of patient (hormonal therapy, pregnancy, data of hormone dosage), more MRI images, discussion of tachycardia (axis, conduction, and so on), data of dyslipidemia (basal LDL-c, basla lipoprotein A, TG, uric, ...)</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:	Marzia Cottini
Department, University & Country	Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Italy