

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_99813</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Stenosing intracardiac mass of the mitral valve : Case report and data from the literature.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- The manuscript is important to clarify more about a rare disease.</li> <li>2- The title is suitable</li> <li>3- The abstract is comprehensive, although it could be better, clearer.</li> <li>4- Subsections and structure are neutral.</li> <li>5- Yes, scientifically this manuscript is correct.</li> <li>6- References are recent and sufficient for the modality of the article</li> </ol> <p>As additionally recommend to rewrite in the abstract the description of the diagnosis of the studied woman.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	Yes, academic quality language	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	In the presentation of the case contained in the abstract of the article, I make the following writing suggestion: "In our case, as reported in the literature, the diagnosis was evoked by TTE, TEE, cardiac magnetic resonance and even positron emission tomography. Only histopathological examination after complete resection of the tumor accurately confirmed the diagnosis".	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aron da Silva Pereira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Estadual Paulista "Júlio de Mesquita Filho" UNESP, Brazil</b>