

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Cardiology Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJCR_123099 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Pheochromocytoma presenting as decompensated dilated cardiomyopathy: 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 but clinically significant presentation of pheochromocytoma as decompensated dilated cardiomyopathy, highlighting the importance of considering this diagnosis in patients with unexplained heart failure. The case underscores the potential for atypical presentations of pheochromocytoma, which could contribute to earlier detection and treatment in similar cases. However, the manuscript lacks depth in its discussion and does not sufficiently emphasize the broader implications for clinical practice, which diminishes its overall impact on the scientific community. Improvements in clarity, analysis, and visual presentation would enhance its value for readers and researchers.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The current title, "Pheochromocytoma Presenting as Decompensated Dilated Cardiomyopathy: A Rare Case Report," accurately describes the case but could be made more concise and impactful. An alternative title could be: "Pheochromocytoma as a Cause of Decompensated Dilated Cardiomyopathy: A Rare Case Report"</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>The abstract provides a general overview of the case but could be enhanced with more specific details about the patient's management and outcome after the diagnosis of pheochromocytoma. Additionally, it would benefit from highlighting the clinical significance of recognizing pheochromocytoma as a potential cause of unexplained dilated cardiomyopathy. Simplifying the conclusion and avoiding redundancy would also improve clarity. Including these elements would make the abstract more comprehensive and informative for readers.</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, following a typical case report format with sections for the Introduction, Case Presentation, Discussion, and Conclusion. However, there could be improvements in the organization and detail of some sections. For instance, the Introduction could provide a more detailed background on pheochromocytoma and its potential to cause dilated cardiomyopathy, setting the stage for the case. The Case Presentation section is well-structured but could benefit from a more concise and focused narrative. Additionally, the Discussion could be enhanced by a clearer exploration of the pathophysiological mechanisms and a more thorough comparison with other reported cases. Overall, while the structure is acceptable, refining the content within these subsections would improve the manuscript's clarity and impact.</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 diagnosing pheochromocytoma through appropriate biochemical tests and imaging, which align with established clinical guidelines. The case presentation is technically sound, detailing the patient's symptoms, diagnostic process, and treatment approach in a logical sequence. However, while the manuscript adheres to correct diagnostic procedures, it would benefit from a more thorough discussion of the pathophysiological mechanisms linking pheochromocytoma to dilated cardiomyopathy. Strengthening this aspect could enhance the scientific robustness of the paper.</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 included in the manuscript are relevant but somewhat dated. To strengthen the scientific rigor and reflect current knowledge, I recommend incorporating more recent studies and reviews. Adding references such as "Pheochromocytoma and Paraganglioma: Current Clinical Management" and "Advances in the Diagnosis and Management of Pheochromocytoma" would provide updated insights into diagnostic and therapeutic advancements. Additionally, including recent case reports and systematic reviews, such as "Cases of Pheochromocytoma Presenting as Cardiomyopathy: A Systematic Review," would offer a broader context and enhance the manuscript's relevance to current clinical practice.</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article are generally adequate but require some improvements for better clarity and scholarly communication. The manuscript contains minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that could hinder readability. Enhancing sentence structure, ensuring consistency in terminology, and refining the overall flow would improve the manuscript's quality and make it more suitable for publication. A thorough proofreading and revision process is recommended to address these issues and ensure the manuscript meets the high standards of scholarly communications. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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: | Fuat Polat |
| Department, University & Country | Dr. Siyami Ersek Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery Education Research Hospital, Türkiye |