

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJCR_99080</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Free wall rupture : the fatal complication not to forget .</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.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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>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></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is not too important for the scientific community. Left ventricular free wall rupture is a well studied topic and another case report on it has little scientific novelty or merit.</p> <p>2. The title should be changed according to the suggestion in the annotated manuscript attached to this review.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure should be modified according to the suggestion in the annotated manuscript attached to this review.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. References should be corrected to follow the Journal's instructions for authors.</p> <p>7. Attached to this review is the annotated manuscript with comments and suggestions. Please read it and implement the suggested changes.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. The English quality is not suitable for scholarly communication, suggestions and corrections are available in the annotated manuscript attached to this review.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ingrid Prkačin
Department, University & Country	Clinical Hospital Merkur, Croatia