

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_118491
Title of the Manuscript:	Congenital Atrioventricular Block in an Adolescent Female: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

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> <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. The manuscript presented is likely an important contribution to the scientific community, as it describes a rare clinical case of congenital atrioventricular block (CAVB) in an adolescent female. This manuscript may be of interest to clinicians, researchers, and those working in the field of cardiology, as it highlights the diagnostic challenges and management strategies associated with this complex cardiac disorder. This manuscript may also serve as a valuable resource for further research aimed at improving diagnosis and management strategies for this rare condition. 2. The title effectively describes the focus of the article, which is the rare occurrence of congenital atrioventricular block (CAVB) in a teenaged female patient. The title clearly indicates that the article is a case report, with a concise yet informative description of the patient's presentation, diagnostic challenges, and management strategies. 3. The abstract provides a useful overview of the research article, but there is room for improvement in terms of providing a more detailed and comprehensive summary. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate. However, that needs some correction. The Introduction section must introduce the condition and clearly state why the case report is worth reading. It may also contain a brief mention of the current status of the problem being described with supporting references that this text is lack of it. Please expand this part The Case Presentation section provides a detailed review of the patient's presentation, diagnostic challenges, and management strategies, including the physical examination, laboratory investigations, imaging findings, and management decisions. please note that the case must be presented succinctly, in chronological order, clearly highlighting the salient aspects of the case being reported. Putting Figures and tables in case of presentation, not in discussion part. Discussion Thus, the discussion must summarize the unique aspects of the case (why is the case different?) and the essential learning points/implications (how will it change management? /What further research needs to be done?). In addition to stating the differences from existing literature, the discussion should also attempt to explain these differences. The conclusion of the manuscript is straightforward and focused on the key points of the study. 5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. 6. The references cited in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and recent but please arrange them according to Vancouver style. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>In general, the text requires grammatical English correction.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Motahareh Ghodrati
Department, University & Country	Qom University of Medical Sciences, Iran