

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJCR_123099</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Pheochromocytoma presenting as decompensated dilated cardiomyopathy: A rare case report</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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></p>	<p>YES. The case report manuscript is, but of high importance for scholarly instituted institutions (Universities, Teaching Hospitals and other Research Institutions). The findings and discussions of this case report manuscript will contribute immensely by adding more knowledge to the already existing. Hence, a reference material also for young scientists coming up.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>YES. Especially from a scholarly view, the case report manuscript titled "<b>Pheochromocytoma presenting as decompensated dilated cardiomyopathy</b>" is of high value, appropriate for scholarly interest globally.</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>YES. The abstract of the case report manuscript is accurate, to the fact and coherent. However, the following should also be noted in the abstract: <b>Introduction, Patient concerns, Diagnosis, Intervention, Outcomes and Lessons.</b>  <b>Author(s), please</b> also note the following in the abstract: <b>Introduction, Patient concerns, Diagnoses, Intervention, Outcomes and Lessons.</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>YES. The subsections and the entire structure of the manuscript is not only highly appropriate but also followed the international best practice(s) spanning from: Abstract, Introduction, Case Presentation, Discussion, Conclusion and Reference etc. Author(s) should take note of the title of figures as indicated in the feedback column.</p> <p>Author(s), please take note of the ways in which <b>Figure(s)</b> is/are labeled in a manuscript. It should reflect the numbering of the subsection or section as the case maybe. <b>(Figure 2.1):</b> The electrocardiogram (ECG) demonstrates atrial tachycardia-fibrillation at a heart rate of 139 beats per minute (bpm).</p> <p>An echocardiogram was conducted, which revealed a dilated left ventricle with global hypokinesia, LVEF 10%, with an intermediate probability of PAH (PAPS 60 mmHg), and no additional associated signs <b>(Figure 2.2).</b></p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>YES. The case report manuscript is scientifically correct. And it could be more scientifically correct after reviewing the aspect of discussion comparatively with other scientifically published related journal papers. Author(s) could look at this example (Pheochromocytoma-related cardiomyopathy presenting as acute myocardial infarction. A case report: <a href="https://journals.lww.com/md-journal/Fulltext/2021/03190/Pheochromocytoma_related_cardiomyopathy_presenting.50.aspx">https://journals.lww.com/md-journal/Fulltext/2021/03190/Pheochromocytoma_related_cardiomyopathy_presenting.50.aspx</a>)</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>SOMEHOW (references from 2012, 2011). The references are in place and somehow recent (references from 2012, 2011) and it could be more recent (from 2020 and above) and sufficient after reviewing the discussion session comparatively with other researchers who have published interrelated articles/journal papers</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>YES. The quality of the language (written) of the manuscript is not only suitable but also acceptable for intellectual communications across the globe.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Author(s) must read more recent (from 2020 and above) related literature to further have a thought-provoking discussion (comparatively) regarding the findings (results) of this case report research work.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Samuel Joseph Bebeley</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Njala University, Sierra Leone</b>