

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_129105
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute myocarditis mimicking inferior wall myocardial infarction: A case report
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>

Review Form 3

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.	Young patients presenting with ST elevation on ECG mimicking acute myocardial infarction could have other differential diagnosis like myocarditis, coronary spasm etc and it is important to consider all these differential diagnosis especially in the absence of risk factors as treatment of each of these conditions differs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive. However, there is an error in the abstract. It states patient had an ECG indicative of anterior wall myocardial infarction which should be Inferior wall myocardial infarction	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, language is suitable for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the patient thrombolysed ? The angiogram shows mid right coronary artery having plaque and no RAO view picture is included . If the patient was thrombolysed this could be a recanalized vessel. Please include a RAO view of RCA 2. The NT pro BNP was elevated so was the patient clinically in heart failure . If so would such a patient tolerate a high dose of steroid. 3. MRI should have been done as it is the gold standard 4. The ECG shows PR interval prolongation . Was the patient investigated for Lyme's disease, Diphtheria etc which cause myocarditis with PR prolongation 5. What are the current guidelines for steroid use in myocarditis in adults as well as role of IV IG to be included in the discussion 	

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:	Michelle Viegas
Department, University & Country	Goa Medical College and Hospital, India