

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_117560
Title of the Manuscript:	Idiopathic Pericardial Tamponade in the Absence of Predisposing Factors: A Diagnostic Conundrum and Therapeutic Approach
Type of the Article	

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.journalijrc.com/index.php/AJRCD/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the article discusses about various etiologies of pericardial effusion and the investigations needed to be done in such cases. It also highlights that in some cases all investigations may be negative and it may be a rare or idiopathic cause, article also highlights how to approach and treat such idiopathic cases with cochlincine or steroids 2. Yes The title conveys the content of the article and is suitable 3. Yes the abstract is comprehensive 4. Yes the subsections are appropriate 5. Yes while very rare causes of pericardial effusion have not been ruled out still it has covered of what is known in scientific literature 6. Yes references are sufficient 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes the language is suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Authors need to keep possibility of a viral / post viral etiology for pericardial effusion and can clarify about it</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Cinosh Mathew
Department, University & Country	SBKS Medical Institute and Research Centre, Sumandeep Vidyapeeth Deemed to be University, India