

**Review Form 3**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_CA_125875   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Uncommon Infection of Pericardial Hydatid Cyst Imitating Cardiac rhabdomyosarcoma: A Challenging Diagnosis and the Role of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Imaging</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Case report</b>   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.                        | This manuscript addresses a rare but significant case of pericardial hydatid cyst co-infected with <i>Brevundimonas nasdae</i> , contributing to the limited literature on cardiac hydatidosis and its atypical presentations. By highlighting the diagnostic challenges associated with distinguishing hydatid cysts from malignant tumors like rhabdomyosarcoma, the authors emphasize the critical role of advanced imaging techniques, particularly MRI, in achieving accurate diagnoses. This case underscores the need for increased awareness among clinicians regarding the potential for co-infections in atypical presentations, which can lead to better patient outcomes. Overall, I appreciate the manuscript for its originality, thoroughness, and the valuable insights it offers into the complexities of diagnosing and managing rare cardiac infections.  |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  | The title of the article is suitable, as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the case report.  |   |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.   | The abstract of the article is comprehensive, effectively summarizing the case report and highlighting the key elements of the diagnosis, imaging techniques, and the unique co-infection.   |   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript appear appropriate for a case report.  |   |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, it presents a rare case of pericardial hydatid cyst co-infected with <i>Brevundimonas nasdae</i> , contributing valuable data to the limited literature on cardiac hydatidosis and atypical infections. The diagnostic process is well-documented, utilizing appropriate imaging techniques like echocardiography, CT, and MRI, which are crucial for distinguishing between potential differential diagnoses such as rhabdomyosarcoma. Additionally, the manuscript incorporates relevant serological findings, surgical intervention details, and histopathological confirmation, ensuring a comprehensive approach to diagnosis and treatment. By integrating clinical, radiological, and microbiological aspects, the study provides a thorough and methodologically sound investigation that emphasizes the importance of considering rare co-infections in clinical practice. |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and provide a solid foundation for the discussion on cardiac hydatid cysts and their associated complications. They include both classic and recent studies that contextualize the findings of the case report.   |   |

**Review Form 3**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments<br><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b> | <b>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication.</b> |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | <b>Excellent case report.</b>  |  |

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Aniket Madhukar Zope</b>   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Symbiosis Medical College for Women, Symbiosis University Hospital and Research Centre, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), India</b> |