

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_127765
Title of the Manuscript:	Right Aortic Arch with Left Subclavian Artery Atresia and Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction in a 43-Year-Old Male; First Case in Literature
Type of the Article	Case report

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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Even though there are documented cases of Right Aortic Arch with Left Subclavian Artery Atresia, this manuscript presents a unique and valuable contribution to the scientific community by documenting the first reported case of a right aortic arch with left subclavian artery atresia presenting with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF). It raises the possibility of a pathophysiological connection between these conditions, prompting further investigation to determine whether the association is causal or coincidental. The case underscores the critical role of advanced imaging and detailed clinical evaluations in diagnosing rare vascular anomalies, which can manifest with atypical symptoms or unexplained findings. By sharing this case, the manuscript provides a foundation for future research into the cardiovascular implications of such anomalies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The original authors title is not totally accurate as it doesn't convey the Case report intentions or details properly; to better convey the case report details and intention, I would suggest the following title for the case report- "The First Reported Case of Right Aortic Arch with Left Subclavian Artery Atresia Presenting with Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction: Exploring an Uncertain Causal Relationship" I firmly believe the words "uncertain causal relationship" add more weight and are useful to better convey the case report intentions, details and better grab the reader's attention	

Review Form 3

<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 is poorly written, contains poor sentence structuring and grammatical errors [eg: aortic needs to be changed to aorta] and needs addition of extra case specific details to convey what the case report is about and why it is important</p> <p>Abstract is the first thing a reader will look at to decide on whether they should spend time reading the whole case report and a novel case like this needs a well written abstract</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The findings presented in the manuscript are largely scientifically accurate, but there is an error regarding the most common type of RAA. The manuscript incorrectly states that type II is the most common, while the cited source indicates that type I is the most common.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, the Introduction and Discussion sections have sufficient number of citations but although relevant, some of the references are not recent.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article needs rephrasing and proper structuring of sentences along with correction of grammatical errors for enhancing overall readability and I therefore believe it needs revision before it can be considered suitable for proper scientific discourse</p> <p>In its present form the manuscript is not suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the dimensions of the images in the manuscript for clear visibility of details 2. The treatment or management part in the case presentation section is vague and more details on how the patient was exactly managed is needed 3. The Discussion section is short, needs further expansion and is without much takeaways for the reader 4. Yellow Highlights and Comments have also been added for easy understanding to the case report document titled "Ms_CA_127765" and this document has also been submitted at the time of submitting this review document 	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mallikarjuna Subramanyam Oruganti</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Osmania Medical College, India</p>