

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_116956
Title of the Manuscript:	Rare case of right ventricular perforation during pericardiocentesis: Case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1.Right ventricular perforation is a rare but serious complication of pericardiocentesis, a procedure commonly used to diagnose and treat pericardial effusions. This manuscript is significant as it sheds light on a critical issue, providing valuable data on the incidence, risk factors, management strategies</p> <p>2.It adequately reflects the key focus of the manuscript</p> <p>3. Based on description, the abstract seems to provide a clear overview of the case and its significance, which is commendable.</p> <p>4. The structure of your manuscript is robust, with clear and logical subsections that facilitate an understanding of the case and its broader implications.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears scientifically correct and provides a valuable contribution to the field of cardiology, particularly in understanding and managing complications of pericardiocentesis.</p> <p>6. This manuscript is well-supported by the current references, but I recommend incorporating additional recent and diverse sources to enhance the scientific rigor and comprehensiveness of this work.</p> <p>7.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>the English quality of the manuscript is generally 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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Qinglan Shu
Department, University & Country	University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, China