

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_126322
Title of the Manuscript:	Myocardial bridging Diagnosis and Management in a student pilot candidate a case study with literature review
Type of the Article	Case Study

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The importance of this manuscript lies in its focus on myocardial bridging within the unique context of aeromedical evaluation, a setting where even asymptomatic or seemingly benign cardiac anomalies can have significant implications for aircrew safety and operational fitness. By presenting a case with diagnostic and management challenges, the manuscript contributes to the literature on risk stratification and management strategies for myocardial bridging among aviators, who may be exposed to additional physiological stressors. However, the manuscript could benefit from enhanced structure, clearer emphasis on its novel contributions to aeromedical cardiology, and a more in-depth discussion of specific risk factors for aviators with myocardial bridging.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Myocardial Bridging Diagnosis and Management in a Student Pilot Candidate: A Case Study with Literature Review," could be improved to reflect the unique aeromedical context and emphasize its implications for aircrew fitness. A more focused and descriptive title might be: "Myocardial Bridging in Aeromedical Evaluation: Diagnostic and Management Challenges in a Pilot Candidate" or "Aeromedical Fitness Considerations in Myocardial Bridging: A Case Study and Literature Review." These alternatives provide a clearer sense of the manuscript's scope and its relevance to aeromedical and cardiovascular communities.	
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 covers the essential elements of the case, the diagnostic findings, and the implications of myocardial bridging in the context of aeromedical fitness. However, it could be strengthened by adding a few more details and refining its focus for better clarity and completeness. Here are some suggested adjustments: 1. Clarify Key Findings and Implications: Briefly mention specific risks associated with myocardial bridging for aviators, such as ischemic events and the added physiological stressors (e.g., hypoxia, acceleration forces), to contextualize why this condition is critical for flight fitness assessment. 2. Conclude with Implications for Aeromedical Practice: The abstract should end with a statement on the broader implications of this case for aeromedical screening and risk assessment policies, highlighting any potential recommendations for managing myocardial bridging in flight crew.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's current structure is generally appropriate but could be refined to improve clarity and flow, especially to emphasize aeromedical implications and highlight the case's relevance. Here are some specific suggestions for improving the structure and subsections: 1. Abstract: The abstract is already in place but could be refined, as noted previously, to clarify the case's significance and key findings. 2. Introduction: o Expand this section to include a brief overview of myocardial bridging in the general population versus aviators and explain why it holds unique relevance in aeromedical assessments. o Briefly mention the main aim of the manuscript—evaluating myocardial bridging's potential impact on flight fitness. 3. Case Presentation: o This section effectively outlines the patient's demographics, clinical findings, and diagnostic steps. o Consider consolidating the findings into a more streamlined, narrative format to enhance readability. For example, group diagnostic results (e.g., ECG, echocardiography, coronary CT) together with concise descriptions of the findings. 4. Discussion: o While thorough, this section could benefit from clearer segmentation to help readers follow the logic of the argument. Suggested subheadings might include:	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Prevalence and Pathophysiology: Detail the prevalence of myocardial bridging in general and aviator populations, explaining how research methods affect reported rates.▪ Clinical Implications and Risks: Discuss potential clinical outcomes of myocardial bridging, especially the risk of ischemia in aviators.▪ Aeromedical Considerations: Specifically address the implications for flight fitness, considering physiological stressors unique to aviation, such as hypoxia and +Gz forces.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Including these subheadings can enhance readability and ensure each aspect is addressed systematically. <p>5. Aeromedical Fitness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The section is appropriate but could be retitled to specify its focus, e.g., Aeromedical Assessment and Fitness for Duty.○ Include a brief outline of general aeromedical assessment protocols, emphasizing how findings of myocardial bridging influence decision-making for flight duties. <p>6. Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The conclusion provides a suitable wrap-up but could include a concise summary of key takeaways from the case.○ Emphasize how this case contributes to the field of aeromedical fitness assessment and any recommendations for future evaluations of similar cases.	
<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 robustness by thoroughly presenting a case of myocardial bridging, supported by comprehensive diagnostic imaging and clinical evaluation. The authors integrate relevant literature to contextualize the physiological and clinical implications of myocardial bridging, especially concerning aeromedical fitness, highlighting the condition's unique risks for aviators. Technical accuracy is upheld through detailed descriptions of diagnostic techniques, including ECG, echocardiography, and coronary CT, each rigorously analyzed and presented with appropriate clinical correlations. Overall, the manuscript's structured approach to presenting evidence, clinical reasoning, and aeromedical considerations reflects a high level of scientific and technical integrity.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>⌋</p>	<p>The references included in the manuscript cover foundational studies and relevant literature on myocardial bridging, particularly in terms of its prevalence, pathophysiology, and implications in aviation medicine. The majority are recent and include a mix of research articles and reviews that provide adequate background. However, some additional recent studies or reviews on myocardial bridging and its clinical impact, particularly in high-stress professions, could enhance the manuscript. Suggested references for added depth might include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A more recent study on the hemodynamic impact of myocardial bridging using advanced imaging techniques.2. Literature specifically addressing cardiovascular risks in high-stress environments like aviation, which might underscore the unique considerations for pilot candidates. <p>Including a few of these could reinforce the manuscript's relevance and ensure that the most up-to-date insights are reflected.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article generally conveys the main ideas but would benefit from refinement to meet scholarly standards. Some sentences are lengthy or lack clarity, which can obscure key points, and there are minor grammatical issues that may impact readability. Enhancing sentence structure, using more precise terminology, and ensuring consistency in tense and phrasing would improve flow and readability, making it more suitable for academic publication. A thorough review by a native English speaker or language editor could significantly elevate the manuscript's scholarly presentation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fuat Polat
Department, University & Country	Dr. Siyami Ersek Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery Training and Research Hospital, Turkey