

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_122492
Title of the Manuscript:	Inverted Takotsubo Syndrome: An Atypical Case in a Young Woman Following an Appendectomy
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it presents a rare and atypical case of Inverted Takotsubo Syndrome (ITS) in a young woman post-appendectomy, challenging the conventional understanding that ITS primarily affects older individuals under emotional stress. By documenting this unusual trigger, the manuscript contributes to expanding the spectrum of conditions associated with ITS, potentially guiding future diagnostic and therapeutic approaches. I appreciate the manuscript for its novel insights and for highlighting the need for awareness of ITS in diverse patient populations, though more detailed discussion on the underlying mechanisms would further enhance its impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, it is</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>I appreciated the abstract, I found it to be very clearly and comprehensively written.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, it is</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough case documentation and adherence to established diagnostic criteria for Inverted Takotsubo Syndrome (ITS). The authors have clearly described the clinical presentation, diagnostic workup, and exclusion of other potential causes, ensuring a strong differential diagnosis. The inclusion of imaging and laboratory data further strengthens the manuscript's validity. Additionally, the discussion effectively contextualizes the case within existing literature, demonstrating a solid understanding of the condition and its atypical presentation in this scenario.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript should be evaluated for their sufficiency and recency to ensure the research is grounded in the most current and relevant literature. If the references include a good mix of foundational studies and recent publications from the last 5-10 years, they can be considered sufficient. However, if there are gaps in citing recent advances or key studies related to Inverted Takotsubo Syndrome, particularly those addressing atypical presentations or younger populations, additional references may be necessary.</p> <p>To make the review more actionable, I would suggest including recent studies on Takotsubo Syndrome that focus on atypical cases or younger patients, as well as any new guidelines or reviews that have been published in the last few years. This would enhance the manuscript's relevance and comprehensiveness.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript appears suitable for scholarly communication, as it is clear, concise, and appropriately formal. The technical terminology is used correctly, and the overall flow of the text supports a coherent presentation of the case study. If there are minor grammatical or stylistic issues, they do not detract from the manuscript's readability or professionalism. This ensures that the manuscript effectively communicates its findings to the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Francesco Varchetta
Department, University & Country	Pineta Grande Hospital, Italy