

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_101902
Title of the Manuscript:	INFECTIVE ENDOCARDITIS REVEALING LAUBRY PEZZI SYNDROME: A RARE 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)
<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. Yes, It is crucial for researchers to provide information for further research activities.</p> <p>2. Yes, It is moderately suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, It is moderately articulated.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is poor and needs major modification and correction.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is moderately accepted, but it needs major modification and correction particularly In the methodology and analysis sections.</p> <p>6. Yes, it is sufficient but needs to be revisited by including recent empirical results.</p> <p>Memo: Please look at the comments seriously so that the researcher will revisit the paper in line with the comments to maintain the credibility of the journal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It is suitable, even if it needs a major correction.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is essential to revisit the introduction, methodology, analysis methods, and referencing section.</p> <p>I strongly advise that the researcher include research area and period; design; sources of data and population; sampling size determination technique; data collection processes; data quality assurance checking techniques; inclusion and exclusion criteria; and ethical considerations in detail.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight
--	--------------------	---

Review Form 1.7

		<i>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:	Yenehun Taye Engida
Department, University & Country	Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia