

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_125489</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Ischemic Stroke Unveiling Takayasu Arteritis Complicated by Coronary Arteritis: Case Report and Literature Review</b>
Type of the Article	Case report

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	<b>The article is interesting because Takayasu arteritis is a rare cause of ischemic stroke. On the other hand, stroke (11%) and coronary damage (3%) seem to be two rare complications in Takayasu, and even more so, their simultaneous association is rare.</b>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>The title of the article is appropriate. However, I think that the part with the review of the literature should not be added, because a review is not really done.</b>	
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.	<b>The summary of the article is comprehensive. Nothing else needs to be added</b>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<b>The structure of the manuscript is adequate</b>	
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.	<b>Here are my comments on the scientific content:</b> <b>1. The case description part could have been more precise. For example, they could be improved:</b> - diagnostic criteria (more precise history, more precise clinical examination, NIHSS score at presentation, duration of symptoms at presentation, etc.) - diagnostic images specific to Takayasu arteritis. The image in the article is a common stroke that could have any cause. It would be interesting to present angiography images that show the vascular damage (briefly described in the article) or CT angiography to highlight specific images for the occlusion that occurs in Takayasu's disease. Because an echocardiography was performed, it would be good to present a typical ultrasound image for Takayasu arteritis <b>2. The patient was hospitalized for an ischemic stroke. What treatment methods have been used for ischemic stroke (thrombolysis?, thrombectomy? etc.) How do these treatments work in the case of Takayasu's disease?</b> <b>3. The discussions are too general; no correlation was found between some bibliographic sources and what is written in the text</b> <b>A more in-depth study of these 2 types of complications would have been useful. why does one appear? Why does the other appear? What are their characteristics? Does interesting information appear when they occur simultaneously?</b> <b>4. It would be good to specify if there were other identical cases published in the literature</b> <b>5. The references are old and basic. No real comparison is made with other cases in the literature</b>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	<b>References are not recent. A brief search reveals articles that present Takayasu's disease and its various complications</b>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<b>I am unable to comment on the quality of the English language used in the article.</b>	
Optional/General comments	<b>The article would be very interesting if improved.</b>  I don't suspect plagiarism There are no issues of competing interests in this manuscript There are no ethical issues in this manuscript	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Elisabeta Antonescu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>"Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu, Romania</b>