

Dear Editor,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the review process for my manuscript, “**Acute Inferior STEMI in a Unique Setting: Case Report on Anomalous Circumflex and Multivessel Coronary Artery Disease**”, submitted to “**BMC Cardiovascular Disorders Journal**”. While I deeply appreciate the thoroughness of peer review in ensuring the highest standards of research publication, I find the current situation unusual and unnecessarily protracted.

Our manuscript has undergone review by **14 reviewers**, of whom **13 have approved it for publication**. However, the latest reviewer has requested outright rejection, despite the overwhelming consensus supporting the quality and validity of our work. Given that peer review is intended to provide balanced and constructive feedback, I am concerned that this single dissenting opinion is being given disproportionate weight over the judgment of the majority.

We have diligently addressed all concerns raised by previous reviewers through several rounds of revisions. At this stage, I kindly request clarification on the journal’s policies regarding the number of reviewers and the consideration of conflicting opinions. Moreover, I seek to understand whether such an extensive review process aligns with the journal’s standard practices.

I would greatly appreciate your guidance on how to proceed and whether a resolution can be reached regarding our submission. I remain committed to upholding the integrity of scientific discourse and look forward to your response.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Hesham Salah Eldin Taha MD

Professor and Head of Cardiology Department

Faculty of Medicine - Cairo University