

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_100436</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Double outlet right ventricle infective endocarditis: a rare combination and a therapeutic challenge</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

### 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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes. Two very rare cases are presented which will never have any specific guidelines because of rarity. Knowledge of successfully treated cases is the only way to decide on treatment options on such cases.</b>  <b>Yes.</b>  <b>Yes.</b>  <b>Yes.</b>  <b>Yes.</b>  <b>Yes.</b>  <b>In the last para of the section on Case 2- it should be 7506 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. In the discussion- duke's criteria should be- Duke's criteria.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nishad Chitnis</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Heart Care Clinic, India</b>