

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_100427
Title of the Manuscript:	HIGH DEGREE ATRIOVENTRICULAR BLOCK: First Presentation of Arrhythmogenic Right Ventricular Cardiomyopathy/Dysplasia
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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manuscript describes a rare presentation of a rare cardiomyopathy. The scientific content is relevant for the awareness of the concerned physician and also for the emergency carers 2. Title of the article is not suitable . It could be 'Complete AVB as a first presentation of ARVC in a middle aged male; A novel clinical entity" 3. The abstract needs rewriting to focus on the present case. 4. The subsections needs revision. The amendment to be done has been marked. The MRI needs more elucidation and diagnosis should be justified with the task force criteria in the relevant section. 5. The manuscript needs to be revised 6. References are sufficient. However, formatting, li ne spacing and vancouver styling needs to be followed. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spelling corrections to be done are marked as red, grammar corrections to be done are marked as green and styling needs to be corrected marked as blue 2. Formatting, Fonts and line spacing needs to be done properly 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript needs major revision. The caser report should bring out the novelty of the clinical presentation and the relevant subsections needs to substantiate the findings.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vivek Kumar
Department, University & Country	Command Hospital Airforce, India