

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_124240
Title of the Manuscript:	Floating right heart thrombus: a spectacular evolution
Type of the Article	Case report

PART 1: 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.	Agree. The case report manuscript is of high value for the research community (like the University Teaching Hospitals and Research Centres). The critically analysed research findings, discussions and conclusion of this case report manuscript can inform scholars by way contributing greatly in knowledge addition to the already existing. Thereby, used as a focus point material for young researchers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Agree. The title of the case report is suitable, especially from a research point of view. The case report manuscript titled " Floating right heart thrombus: a spectacular evolution " is of significant value, appropriate and forward looking for students and researchers globally.	
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.	Agree. The abstract of the case report manuscript is in place. But the following must be noted in the abstract: Introduction, Objective, Methods, Results, Conclusion and Keywords . Please read from the link for details: Floating right heart thrombi: A pooled analysis of cases reported over the past 10years - PubMed (nih.gov)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Agree. The subsections and the full edifice of the case report manuscript is appropriate spanning from: Introduction, Case Presentation, Discussion, Conclusion and Reference etc. However, author(s) should also read from this link for further details: Floating right heart thrombi: A pooled analysis of cases reported over the past 10 years - ScienceDirect	
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.	Agree. The case report manuscript is scientifically accurate. And it could be more, after comparatively reviewing the aspect of discussion with other scientifically published related journal papers. Author(s) please take a look at this example (Floating right heart thrombi: A pooled analysis of cases reported over the past 10 years). A case report: Floating right heart thrombi: A pooled analysis of cases reported over the past 10 years - ScienceDirect	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Agree. The references are in place and a bit recent but it could be more recent and sufficient after comparatively reviewing the discussion session with other research work that have been published: Floating right heart thrombi: A pooled analysis of cases reported over the past 10 years - ScienceDirect	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Agree. Indeed the quality of the written language of the case report manuscript is suitable and also acceptable for researchers and students the line of research globally.	
Optional/General comments	Author(s), please read some more recent related literature to have a compelling discussion and logical conclusion regarding the findings of this case report research.	

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:	Samuel Joseph Bebeley
Department, University & Country	Njala University, Sierra Leone