

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_101774
Title of the Manuscript:	Myocarditis and autoimmune disease post Bariatric surgery: case report.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lac k of N o velt y**', 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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript could be of interest to the scientific community as it explores a potentially significant yet under-studied link between bariatric surgery, autoimmune disease, and myocarditis. However, to truly ascertain its significance, the authors should provide a more detailed discussion of its relevance within the broader scientific context, incorporating existing knowledge and recent studies.</p> <p>The current title provides a broad idea of the case report but could be more specific and informative. An alternative could be: "Case Report: Myocarditis and Autoimmune Disease Development Following Bariatric Surgery - A Possible Nutritional Deficiency Link"</p> <p>The abstract provides a broad overview of the case, however, it could benefit from further details on the methods, main findings, and implications of the study. It also does not mention the complex interplay of malnutrition, autoimmune disease, and myocarditis, which seems to be a central theme of the manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript structure follows a conventional format, but the overall flow could be improved. For example, more detailed subheadings to break down the 'Discussion' section might enhance readability and understanding. The authors should also consider a separate 'Methods' section to outline their diagnostic and treatment processes.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, the scientific concepts seem accurate. However, further information on how certain conclusions were drawn would enhance the credibility of the manuscript. For instance, explaining why specific investigations were chosen, or detailing the diagnostic criteria for myocarditis and the autoimmune disease, would be beneficial.</p> <p>The list of references is extensive and seems to cover the key areas relevant to the topic at hand. The inclusion of recent studies (2021 and 2022) shows the research is up-to-date.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language of the report is suitable for a scholarly audience. The report is generally well-written, making good use of relevant technical language and terminology. However, there are some minor grammar and syntax errors which need to be addressed. For example, in the sentence, "Patient was referred to rheumatology team and neurology team for high CK and skeletal myopathy," it would be more appropriate to say, "The patient was referred to the rheumatology and neurology teams due to high CK levels and skeletal myopathy." Such corrections can improve the overall readability and flow of the paper.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors should provide more context about how this case compares with other similar cases in the literature.</p> <p>It would be helpful to provide more information about the patient's medical history, such as the duration and control of diabetes and hypothyroidism, and their potential impacts on the patient's cardiac health.</p> <p>In the 'Conclusion' section, the authors could emphasize the potential implications of their findings for clinical practice and propose specific areas for future research. For instance, would they suggest</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>additional screening or monitoring for patients with similar profiles? It would be beneficial to clarify the rationale behind certain therapeutic decisions, such as the choice and timing of specific immunosuppressive therapies. The authors might want to consider discussing the challenges and limitations they faced during this case management. It could also be useful to include a visual aid, such as a timeline or flowchart, summarizing the case's progression and management.</p> <p>It is proposed that the authors cite the following articles: Myocarditis Diagnosis: A Method using Mutual Learning-Based ABC and Reinforcement Learning RLMD-PA: a reinforcement learning-based myocarditis diagnosis combined with a population-based algorithm for pretraining weights</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seyed Vahid Moravvej
Department, University & Country	UNSW Sydney, Austria