

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_114495
Title of the Manuscript:	MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION SEEN TARDIVELY COMPLICATED WITH VENTRICULAR SEPTAL RUPTURE WITH RIGHT VENTRICLE DYSFUNCTION: A DILEMMATIC SCENARIO.
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> <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>1. In my opinion, the manuscript is important for the scientific community because it proposes a treatment option for VCR in the early stages. The manuscript presents a clinical case of a 72-year-old patient diagnosed with myocardial infarction of the inferior wall of the left ventricle, complicated by the rupture of a basal segment aneurysm extending to the right ventricle. After which standard drug treatment was prescribed. On the third day, the patient died from refractory cardiogenic shock, which could have been prevented by surgery. The author proposed early differential diagnosis and optimal therapy for these types of cases.</p> <p>2. The title corresponds to the content of the manuscript</p> <p>3. Abstract is provided correctly</p> <p>4. The structure and subsections of the manuscript meet the requirements</p> <p>5. Manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The links used by the author are correctly selected. In my opinion, it would be fashionable to use more recent data: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053077021003335 https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-021-96955-8 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0012369220354969 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10741-024-10387-w and such</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	In my opinion - yes	
<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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Baykulov Azim Kenjayevich
Department, University & Country	Samarkand State Medical University, Uzbekistan