

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_89969
Title of the Manuscript:	Rescue venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in a patient with retrosternal goiter
Type of the Article	Case Report

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Acceptable as it is, but minor correction of grammar and some clarification in the title and key words would be preferable	
Minor REVISION comments	Please refer to my marking and corrections in blue prints. I have added additional words to the original title to do justice to this article which makes it more eye-catching to the reader and likely increase the citation and impact factor. I have deleted thymectomy from the list of key words because the operation is not a thymectomy but a split-sternum thyroidectomy.	
Optional/General comments	This is a good case to present. The atrial septal defect (ASD) may not be an innocent incidental finding but a key factor in the circulatory collapse. The left ventricular inflow was already compromised by the left to right shunt through the ASD (do we know how large is the shunt, or did the cardiologist calculate its value?) In addition, the veno-arterial ECMO further reduced the venous return to the heart and the positive pressure ventilation added a third factor to compromise the left ventricular filling. The left side of the heart was virtually starved of blood! But I would leave this interesting speculation entirely to the option of the authors, as the cardiological team may or may not agree.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	John SM Leung
Department, University & Country	St. Paul's Hospital, China