

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_105361
Title of the Manuscript:	A rare case of intracardiac metastases revealing chondroblastic osteosarcoma in a 30-year-old girl: About a case
Type of the Article	Case report

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript need to have minor correction especially on the structure of the manuscript, how it is written in most of the section.</p> <p>2. Not suitable. - A case report of chondroblastic osteosarcoma with intracardiac metastasis</p> <p>3. The abstract need minor correction in its sentence structure and flow of the abstract.</p> <p>4. The subsections is appropriate, however, the sentence structure in the manuscript need major correction</p> <p>5. Most of the discussion has poor flow of thoughts. Some paragraph has only one sentence and poorly link to the next paragraph. The references cited in the paragraph were not following a proper guide. The discussion part should be link to the case report itself, highlighting why the publication of the case report can be beneficial and added new knowledge to the field. However, in the entire discussion, author did not discuss about the case.</p> <p>6. Kindly add the reference:</p> <p>Yedururi S, et al. Cardiovascular involvement by osteosarcoma: an analysis of 20 patients. <i>Pediatr Radiol.</i> 2016 Jan;46(1):21-33. doi: 10.1007/s00247-015-3449-y. Epub 2015 Sep 28. PMID: 26411434; PMCID: PMC4707059.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No. Strongly suggest for language editing.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lim Ming Chiang
Department, University & Country	Hospital Sultan Haji Ahmad Shah, Malaysia