

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_117506
Title of the Manuscript:	Pericardial Effusion as an Early Indicator of Breast Cancer Recurrence: A Case Report and Discussion
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<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>	<p>The manuscript presents a significant contribution to the scientific community, particularly within the fields of oncology and cardiology. Pericardial effusion as an early indicator of breast cancer recurrence is a relatively uncommon but crucial aspect of cancer management, and this case report sheds light on its diagnostic and therapeutic challenges. By highlighting the importance of timely recognition and intervention, the manuscript provides valuable insights that can potentially improve patient outcomes and guide clinical practice.</p> <p>The title of the article, "Pericardial Effusion as an Early Indicator of Breast Cancer Recurrence: A Case Report and Discussion," effectively communicates the primary focus of the manuscript. It succinctly captures the essence of the case report and its associated discussion. No alternative title is suggested as the current one accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive, providing a concise summary of the background, case presentation, discussion, and conclusion. It effectively outlines the key points of the manuscript, including the significance of pericardial effusion in breast cancer recurrence, the clinical presentation of the case, the complexities of management, and the importance of early recognition and intervention.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate. The abstract, introduction, case presentation, discussion, and conclusion are well-defined and follow a logical flow. Each section serves its purpose in providing context, presenting the case, discussing relevant issues, and drawing conclusions. The structure facilitates easy comprehension and navigation of the manuscript's content.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It presents a well-documented case report supported by relevant discussion and references.</p> <p>Overall, the references cover a range of relevant topics including the diagnosis, management, and clinical outcomes associated with pericardial effusion in breast cancer patients. However, it might be beneficial to include more recent references, especially considering the rapidly evolving nature of oncology and cardiology research. Additionally, including references specifically focusing on the association between breast cancer recurrence and pericardial effusion could further strengthen the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Overall, the language quality of the provided text is suitable for scholarly communication in the medical field. It effectively communicates clinical information and findings relevant to the topic of pericardial effusion in the context of breast cancer recurrence.</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:	Hristo Angelov Stoev
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Plovdiv, Bulgaria