

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</a>   |
| 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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>Yes (please see below in general comments section)</p> <p>Yes (please see below in general comments section)</p> <p>Yes (please see below in general comments section)</p> <p>No (please see below in general comments section)</p> <p>No (please see below in general comments section)</p> <p>No (please see below in general comments section)</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>Yes</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>In this case report titled "A rare case of intracardiac metastases revealing chondroblastic osteosarcoma in a 30-year-old-girl: About a case", the authors present a rare case of osteosarcoma metastasizing to the heart.</p> <p>The topic of this article should be of interest to both cardiologists and oncologists. The topic of the article underlines the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration. In recent years, cardio-oncology has been gaining in importance and joint conferences are being organized internationally.</p> <p>As such, this article brings modern times to the journal.</p> <p>My comments on the article:</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The prevalence, sex and age distribution of osteosarcoma are superficially touched upon in this article, with no literature references.</li> <li>- The mention of the more frequent right-sided cavity involvement described is adapted from a case presentation of Ewing's sarcoma. Ewing sarcoma, however, has a completely different biological behavior from osteosarcoma, so the comment seems irrelevant.</li> <li>- It is stated, in the introduction that there will be a literature review based on the case report, which unfortunately, is not adequately developed in the discussion section.</li> </ul> <p><b>CASE REPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The case study should be structured.</li> <li>- Internal medical history. Complaints. Clinical signs. Laboratory parameters. Imaging (only the transthoracic echo be presented and color superimposition would be necessary there</li> </ul> |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>too). It would be worth mentioning the transoesophageal echo (with presentation of images), as it is essential to perform it in case of suspicion of tumour, as well as the contrast-enhanced cardiac MR result. For histological images, the bone biopsy result should be evaluated alongside the histological image of the metastasis found in the myocardium. The surgical description also needs to be better explained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mention of the chemotherapy regimen is extremely important, as is the patient's progression-free and overall survival data. We also see no information on follow-up.</li> <li>- The case report in its current form is incomplete, as are the accompanying images.</li> </ul> <p><b>DISCUSSION</b><br/>The discussion should include an analysis of the conclusions drawn from the patient's own case and a comparison with the most recent literature. This is done successfully in several places, but in several cases, we see a one-sentence with older literature references.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSIONS</b><br/>Well-written, succinctly written thoughts, reminiscent of the take home message on the slides. However, as this is an article, there is a lack of connecting thoughts and a void at the end about how we can make patient care and survival more effective, mostly because one of the lifetime peaks of osteosarcoma is affecting the younger generation.</p> <p><b>REFERENCES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The literature references are few (17 articles in total) and outdated (1975-2012, 1 article from 2019). Several articles (case report, case review and literature summary) on cardiac metastases of osteosarcoma have been published in recent years, but only one article from 1993 is referenced. In contrast, several articles are referred to by the authors in which the primary tumor is colorectal cancer, cervical tumor, clear cell carcinoma.</li> <li>- The current guideline in use in Europe for osteosarcoma is the ESMO 2020 guideline, however the reference cites guideline from 2012. The American Society of Cancer Oncology (ASCO) guideline for osteosarcoma is the NCCN version 1.2024 – 7.8.2023, which is also not cited.</li> <li>- The European Society of Cardiology (ESC) published a separate guideline on cardio-oncology in 2022, which would have been worth referring to.</li> </ul> <p>I do not support the publication of this article in its current form. Given the importance of the topic, I propose a revision of the case study article, in which the authors take into account my comments and new literature references. The article can then be resubmitted to the journal.</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

**PART 2:**

|  | Reviewer's comment   | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|--|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Name:                            | Revekka Harisi                 |
| Department, University & Country | Semmelweis University, Hungary |