

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_100158</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Case Report of Takayasu's Arteritis With aortic insufficiency As Initial Presentation.</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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Yes, as far as a case report goes it is properly written.	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes, no need for alteration	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes, but there is lack of conformity, some references have the article title put first, others have the authors' names put first. It is up to the editor to decide if such practice is acceptable.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Usually for a case report, the author(s) might add a review of the literature of all the reported cases and sum up their common features and spectrum of variations to add value to the article. But the author in this case may lack the time and resources to do it.	
<b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Adequated	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	See section 6 above	

### 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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>John SM Leung</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>St. Paul's Hospital, China</b>