

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRCD_120431 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | “The Ross Procedure for Laubrey-Pezzi Syndrome: Surgical Success and Post-Operative Neurological Challenges” |
| Type of the Article | |

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript holds significance for the scientific community due to its focus on Laubry-Pezzi syndrome, a rare condition with limited documented surgical interventions. By presenting a successful case of the Ross procedure in a young patient with this syndrome, the article offers valuable data for future treatment strategies. It highlights the potential of the Ross procedure for managing valvular dysfunction in Laubry-Pezzi patients while acknowledging the associated complications and the need for close monitoring. This can contribute to improved treatment options and outcomes for this complex condition. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title of the article, "The Ross Procedure for Laubry-Pezzi Syndrome: Surgical Success and Post-Operative Neurological Challenges", is suitable overall. Alternative 1: "Successful Ross Procedure for Aortic Valve Dysfunction in a Young Patient with Laubry-Pezzi Syndrome: A Case with Ischemic Stroke as a Post-Operative Complication" Alternative 2: "Management of Valvular Dysfunction in Laubry-Pezzi Syndrome: A Case Report on the Ross Procedure and Neurological Considerations" | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p> | <p>Good points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefly describes the patient's condition (Laubry-Pezzi syndrome) and age. • Mentions the use of the Ross procedure and its benefits for young patients. • Highlights a complication (ischemic stroke) and its resolution. • Emphasizes the importance of a multidisciplinary approach. <p>Suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>1.</p> <p>Add cause of valve dysfunction: The abstract mentions the Ross procedure due to a failing mechanical valve, but it would be helpful to know why the patient needed a valve replacement in the first place. Briefly mentioning the original cause of valve dysfunction (e.g., congenital malformation) would provide better context.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Rephrase "post-operative neurological challenges": While this is technically accurate, it's a bit vague. Considering the abstract mentions ischemic stroke resolution, being more specific like "post-operative ischemic stroke and its management" would be clearer.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>Here's an example of a revised abstract incorporating these suggestions:</p> <p>The article discusses a 21-year-old patient with Laubry-Pezzi syndrome who underwent a Ross procedure due to dysfunction of a mechanical aortic valve originally implanted for a congenital malformation. The Ross procedure, using the patient's own pulmonary valve, offers advantages for young patients. Despite successful valve replacement, the patient experienced a post-operative ischemic stroke which resolved with anticoagulation. The case underscores the importance of a multidisciplinary approach and close monitoring for optimal outcomes, contributing valuable insights to the management of similar conditions.</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>Overall, the structure seems to follow the expected format for a case report, making it easy for readers to navigate and understand the presented information</p> | |
| <p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. Firstly, it adheres to a well-structured case report format, presenting the case history, intervention, and outcomes in a clear and organized manner. This facilitates understanding and allows readers to follow the patient's journey.</p> <p>Secondly, the manuscript demonstrates a grasp of relevant medical literature. Citations are provided to support the background information on Laubry-Pezzi syndrome and the Ross procedure. This demonstrates the authors' familiarity with current research and strengthens the credibility of their discussion points.</p> <p>Thirdly, the manuscript openly discusses both the success of the Ross procedure and</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | the post-operative complication (ischemic stroke). This balanced approach avoids overstating positive outcomes and acknowledges potential risks associated with the surgery. This transparency is a hallmark of sound scientific reporting | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>:</p> | <p>Kindly consider recent references.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> References can be reformatted to remove extra brackets and periods at the end. For example, "El-Hamamsy I, Yacoub MH. The Ross operation: a comprehensive review. Circ. 2009;119(6):840-849. PubMed" can be zmieniony na "El-Hamamsy I, Yacoub MH. The Ross operation: a comprehensive review. Circ. 2009;119(6):840-849 [PubMed]". | |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article appear suitable for scholarly communications. Here's why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar and Mechanics: The manuscript seems to have proper grammar and mechanics, with no glaring errors identified. Scientific Style: The writing adopts a formal and objective tone characteristic of scientific writing. Technical Accuracy: The use of medical terminology appears accurate and reflects an understanding of the relevant medical concepts. | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <p>First of all kindly correct spelling - its Laubry-PEZZI.</p> <p>The article looks well-written overall. Here are a few minor corrections I found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the second paragraph of the introduction, it can be rephrased to say "This technique is particularly beneficial for young patients as it can adapt to their growth and increased metabolic needs" instead of "This technique is particularly beneficial for young patients as it adapts to growth and increased metabolic needs". In the third paragraph of the case presentation, "fig2" can be replaced with "Fig. 2" and so on for all the figures mentioned. References can be reformatted to remove extra brackets and periods at the end. For example, "El-Hamamsy I, Yacoub MH. The Ross operation: a comprehensive review. Circ. 2009;119(6):840-849. PubMed" can be zmieniony na "El-Hamamsy I, Yacoub MH. The Ross operation: a comprehensive review. Circ. 2009;119(6):840-849 [PubMed]". | |

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Mohit Sharma |
| Department, University & Country | Sawai Man Singh Medical College, India |