

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_123169
Title of the Manuscript:	AOD haemorrhagic event with tubo-ovarian complex; a rare case report
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 3

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>
<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 addresses a rare and critical bleeding event associated with direct oral anticoagulants (DOAs), highlighting a unique clinical scenario that is underreported in existing literature. Its significance lies in drawing attention to the potential complications of DOAs and emphasizing the need for careful patient education and risk assessment prior to prescription. The case study adds valuable insight into the management of rare haemorrhagic events, which can inform clinical practices and improve patient outcomes. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more comprehensive literature review and better integration of citations to strengthen its scientific contribution.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The full meaning of AOD should be used in the title of the manuscript instead of its acronym</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>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The abstract does not provide enough background on the use of rivaroxaban or vitamin K antagonists (VKAs). Including a brief context on why this comparison is significant would help set the stage for the case study. ii. It does not clearly state the main objective or aim of the case study. It should specify whether the aim is to highlight the rare bleeding event, compare anticoagulants or others. iii. The description of the case involving a "tuboovarian complex" is vague and lacks detail. Important clinical details such as the nature of the bleeding event, management, or outcome are not adequately described. iv. The phrase "tuboovarian complex" is not clearly defined, which may confuse readers unfamiliar with this term. The abstract should provide a concise explanation of this condition and its significance in the context of anticoagulant use. v. The abstract shifts from discussing the incidence of bleeding with rivaroxaban and VKAs to the specific case and then to general advice on patient education and risk assessment. This makes the narrative seem unfocused. A more coherent structure would strengthen the abstract. vi. The abstract does not provide key findings or insights from the case study, such as how the bleeding event was managed or what was learned from this rare occurrence. vii. There is a general statement about the importance of therapeutic education and risk assessment, but the abstract does not connect this statement to the specific case presented. It would be beneficial to mention any specific lessons or recommendations drawn from this case. viii. The sentence "This is the most effective way of preventing bleeding complications" is a broad statement that could be rephrased to specifically address the context of the case or anticoagulant use. ix. The abstract ends abruptly without a clear conclusion or takeaway message that sums up the significance of the case study or provides direction for clinical practice. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, structure of manuscript is appropriate. Although a section to provide a background of some of the technical terms in the work such as DOAs amongst others, could be beneficial</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 demonstrates scientific correctness by accurately describing a rare bleeding event associated with direct oral anticoagulants, aligning with known risks. The case is well-detailed, reflecting current understanding of anticoagulant-related bleeding. However, more recent references and supporting citations would enhance its scientific robustness.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The authors provide a list of references; however, there are no corresponding citations within the body of the report. Additionally, the work would be improved by incorporating more recent citations to enhance its relevance.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is generally appropriate but would benefit from some minor rephrasing for clarity and flow</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No citations? ii) Section is too narrow and void of information to help readers understand the foundation of the field. iii) While the introduction briefly mentions the use of Direct Oral Anticoagulants (DOAs) in clinical settings, it does not provide enough specific context about their significance, advantages, or how they compare to other anticoagulants. Including details on why DOAs are preferred or how they differ from traditional anticoagulants would help set the stage. iv) The introduction uses "Direct Oral Anticoagulants (DAAs)" initially, but later refers to them as "AODs." Consistency in terminology is important to avoid confusion. Choose one acronym and use it consistently throughout the paper. v) While it mentions that bleeding is a known risk, the introduction does not provide details about the frequency or severity of bleeding events associated with DOAs compared to other anticoagulants. Adding some data or referencing pivotal studies would provide a stronger foundation. vi) The introduction does not mention which specific DOACs are involved, such as rivaroxaban, apixaban, or dabigatran. Identifying the specific drugs would give readers a clearer understanding of the topic. vii) The introduction lacks a defined problem statement that highlights the significance of the case study. Explicitly stating why this rare hemorrhagic event is noteworthy would make the introduction more compelling. viii) The introduction jumps from discussing general bleeding risks to introducing the case study without a clear transition. Including a sentence that bridges the general risks to the specific case would enhance the flow. ix) There is no mention of any existing literature or previous cases that might relate to this event. Briefly citing previous research or case studies on bleeding events with DOAs could help position this case within the broader context. x) The introduction should outline the purpose of presenting this case study. It's important to mention what this study aims to achieve, whether it's to raise awareness, provide clinical insights, or guide future practice. xi) The sentence "The pivotal trials that led to the marketing authorization of these drugs demonstrated that the risk of serious haemorrhage persisted with AODs" could be more precise. Consider revising to make it clearer how these trials are directly relevant to the presented case. <p>Case Presentation:</p> <p>The authors mentioned "The remainder of the clinical examination yielded no noteworthy findings". It will be helpful if those remaining examinations are duly mentioned for more clarity.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>There is no clear call to action for clinicians who might encounter similar cases. Including a directive or an emphasis on vigilance when prescribing AODs would make the conclusion more engaging and memorable.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The phrase "requires rapid and appropriate management" lacks specificity. It would be more impactful to outline what constitutes "appropriate management" in such cases, potentially referencing established</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>protocols or guidelines.</p> <p>There is no mention of what should be done moving forward, either in clinical practice or research. Including a statement about the need for more research, better risk assessment protocols, or patient monitoring would provide a forward-looking perspective.</p> <p>Overall, the conclusion needs to be more comprehensive, summarizing the case's significance, offering clear clinical insights, and providing actionable recommendations for future practice or research.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Jeremiah Isuwa
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Kashere, Nigeria