



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_34890
Title of the Manuscript:	ENDOMYOCARDIAL FIBROSIS: AN UNUSUAL PRESENTATION
Type of the Article	Case study

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Endomyocardial fibrosis is a tropical disease, characterised by fibrosis in the endocardium and subjacent myocardium affecting particularly the inflow tract and the apex of one or both ventricles. This case highlights the occurrence of EMF in an elderly woman without the typical/characteristic physical findings of EMF. Although the case study shows potential interest, there are some critical points to be revised: 1. The authors need to provide high resolution figures, especially figure 3. 2. The authors need to provide figure legends for figures. 3. Echocardiography is the most useful and standard technique for diagnosing Endomyocardial fibrosis. The authors should to provide high resolution Echocardiogram Video. 4. Cardiovascular magnetic resonance imaging (CMR) is complimentary to transthoracic echocardiography for diagnosing EMF. Do you have any results of CMR.	I agree with the reviewer's introduction modifications. I was trying to show an atypical presentation of EMF. I am sorry the patient is now death and we will not be able to get more pictures or video. CMR is not available in my centre
Minor REVISION comments	1. In discussion, the authors should discuss the reasons for the diagnosis. 2. Chest X-ray (Figure 2) showed cardiomegally, upper lobe diversion, widespread interstitial shadows and blunted right recess, and so on. The authors need to point out the changes with arrow in figure. 3. There are some errors in grammar and typography. It is recommended to go through the paper a few more times to correct these errors. Such as, in line 65, "DICUSSION" should be "DISCUSSION".	1. noted and done 2. noted and done 3. noted



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Although the case report shows potential interest, there are some points to be revised.	
---	---	--