

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_124592
Title of the Manuscript:	High GradeAtrioventricular Block Reveals Rare Transthyretin CardiacAmyloidosis: Case Report
Type of theArticle	Case report

PART1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presents a rare case of high-grade atrioventricular block (AVB) secondary to transthyretin cardiac amyloidosis (ATTR-CA), a condition often underdiagnosed. The case is particularly important as it highlights the significance of AVB as a potential early indicator of amyloid cardiomyopathy. The report emphasizes the importance of early diagnosis to improve patient outcomes, thus making it a valuable contribution to both clinical knowledge and practice in cardiology.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and descriptive, appropriately reflecting the rare nature of the case and the main finding (AVB leading to the diagnosis of ATTR-CA). No alternative title is necessary as the current one effectively captures the manuscript's scope.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is well-structured but could benefit from minor elaboration in the case report section. It is suggested to briefly mention diagnostic tools, such as echocardiography and cardiac MRI, which confirmed the diagnosis of amyloidosis, as this would give readers a clearer idea of the diagnostic process in a summary form. Additionally, providing more details about the patient's treatment would enhance its clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? -	The manuscript follows a logical structure, beginning with a clear introduction, followed by a detailed case presentation, and concluding with an insightful discussion. No major changes are necessary in terms of structure. However, the discussion could benefit from deeper analysis regarding the clinical management of similar cases, especially considering the rarity of ATTR-CA presenting with AVB as the primary symptom.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically sound and technically robust. It provides thorough documentation of the case, including relevant diagnostic tests and clinical findings. The use of echocardiography, cardiac MRI, and laboratory tests to rule out other causes of AVB is commendable. The discussion on the multifactorial pathogenesis of conduction disorders in ATTR-CA is both relevant and well-referenced. Furthermore, the manuscript adds value by highlighting the consideration of pacemaker implantation in patients with amyloid cardiomyopathy, which is a critical clinical decision.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are sufficient and relevant to the topic. Most of the references are recent, with some notable reviews and studies cited. However, it could be beneficial to include more recent publications, particularly from the last 2-3 years, that might address advances in amyloid cardiomyopathy diagnostics or treatment options.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and concise, but there are minor grammatical and stylistic issues that could be improved for scholarly communication. For example, in some sections, the sentence structure is slightly awkward, and there are minor punctuation errors. A language edit is recommended for fluency and clarity.	

Review Form 3

Optional/General comments	Based on the content of the manuscript. The manuscript is scientifically valuable but requires some minor improvements, particularly in the recent discussion references and language.	
---------------------------	--	--

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suvendu Kumar Panda
Department, University & Country	MKCG Medical College and Hospital, India