

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_100225
Title of the Manuscript:	Takotsubo Syndrome: An Unusual Presentation Mimicking STEMI
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.journalijrc.com/index.php/AJRCD/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>Yes. The authors describe a case of Takotsubo syndrome which they claim to exhibit unusual presentation mimicking STEMI. Such unusual presentation needs to be documented.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes but some points need clarification and elaboration. Use uniform nomenclature throughout the text- in abstract and title Takotsubo syndrome is used but in the main text Takotsubo cardiomyopathy is used. Authors did not elaborate on the past medical history and present condition just prior to hospital admission. Nothing is mentioned about any pre-existing neurological and psychological conditions or presence of any triggering stressors both mental and physical. These are important criteria for diagnosis. Authors did not mention about the diagnostic criteria employed to determine the present case as Takotsubo syndrome. Did they use any diagnostic scoring system? Why the authors did not suggest for the assessment of BNP / NT-pro-BNP levels which are markedly elevated in Takotsubo syndrome in contrast to ACS. Follow-up imaging could have been submitted in support of resolution of the condition and improvement in LVEF. More recent references on the topic can be included - example – Ghadri JR, et al A novel clinical score (Inter TAK diagnostic score) to differentiate Takotsubo syndrome from acute coronary syndrome: results from the International Takotsubo Registry. Eur. J. Heart Failure. 2017; 19: 1036-1042.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In key words; Taku-Tsubo to be corrected as Takotsubo In discussion Line-5 _ obstructivecoronary – give space between two words.</p>	
<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:	C. S. Ramesh Babu
Department, University & Country	Muzaffarnagar Medical College, Atal Behari Vajpayee Medical University, India