Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_88126
Title of the Manuscript:	Syncopal status revealing a massive intracardiac thrombi complicated by pulmonary embolism
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/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	 This is a clinically important presentation of a condition that requires a high index of clinical suspicion which if missed can be proved to be catastrophic Although the clinical information is relevant, a serious consideration for the grammatical construct including adherence to medical terminology should be maintained to avoid losing the impact of the article. I would refrain from using statements such as 'Between heparin treatment, fibrinolysis and embolectomy, the data from reported cases and meta-analyses seem to be disparate' as there is enough evidence to support the use of each modality based on the clinical scenario, it would be advisable to back up such statements with appropriate references. This statement needs clarification. Syncope is a type of brief loss of knowledge with tonic-clonic convulsions without loss of urine or biting of the tongue, or postcritical coma. Could clearer TTE images be included as the image is of low quality and does not project well. Any reason for not administering thrombolysis? Although not clear, the thrombus in Figure 6 is present in the right main pulmonary artery? With syncopal features large volume thrombus, why thrombolysis was not considered? Was thrombectomy not an option? I would refer to clear AHA and ESC guidelines and include these in the discussion section The references need to be reviewed with adherence to a single type of referencing 	
Minor REVISION comments	It may be imperative to address the issues as highlighted as above to ensure that the article is still impactful	
Optional/General comments	Overall a clinical useful topic has been described, the authors should be commended on highlighting this.	

PART 2:

		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:	Debkumar Chowdhury
Department, University & Country	University of Glasgow, United Kingdom

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)