

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_124083
Title of the Manuscript:	"FROM TAMPONADE TO TRIUMPH: LA rupture leading to cardiac tamponade during BMV managed successfully with Device closure followed by successful BMV"
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 article is of profound importance as it describes the timely management of cardiac tamponade in cath lab scenarios, thereby providing a path for coming up cardiologist across globe on efficient, minimally invasive management of such frequently occurring procedural complications. Such success stories are to be shared in the world of medical literature, as many patients might be saved by an efficient team as emergency surgical management, though a viable option, often results in more morbidity and mortality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"FROM TAMPONADE TO TRIUMPH: Use of percutaneous occluder device to salvage a patient who developed hemodynamically significant hemopericardium due to LA rupture during BMV – A case report."	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. I suggest that the authors should add comprehensive stats of such complications and the different management strategies, including conservative, surgical and device closures.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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.	Most of such complications land a patient in operating rooms under emergency conditions. The outcomes, pos- emergency surgery, are always poor than under planned circumstances. Thus minimal access, percutaneous methods to seal off such rents by expert hands can salvage a good number of patients in cath labs across the globe.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	At least 10 references of reputed authors/journals are quite needed to make this article robust.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are a number of grammatical errors in this article, which i have highlighted in YELLOW. 2. A sentence cannot start with an abbreviation or numerical. 3. An abbreviation expanded in previous sentences can be routinely mentioned in other areas of the manuscript. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article needs a strong grammatical correction and revision.	

Review Form 3

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:	Imran Hussain Bhat
Department, University & Country	Government Medical College, India