

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>)

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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It's a completed article and I have some questions.</p> <p>1. Regarding the presentation of blood test results, I seldom see the breakdown of different types of blood cells. Did this signify anything specific? If I added up the counts, the patient appears to have leukocytosis. Were there other potential sources of infection for the patient? Were other infectious agents ruled out, such as adenoviruses, enteroviruses, and influenza virus?</p> <p>2. In reference to the description of hemorrhagic fluid in the article, did the fluid's characteristics lean more towards a history of bleeding or were they caused during the procedure? If it leaned towards a history of bleeding, could there be further discussion in this regard, or did the patient have a history of trauma in recent?</p> <p>3. Did you use empirical antibiotics as treatment for the possibility of infection and does it need antibiotics for idiopathic pericardial effusion? Was there any follow-up after observing bilateral pleural effusion on the CT scan, because the amount seemed not little.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Te-Kai Liao
Department, University & Country	Taiwan