

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_101020</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Severe pulmonary hypertension secondary to concomitant mitral stenosis with veno-occlusive disease in the context of systemic sclerosis: Importance of careful and comprehensive assessment.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</b>

### 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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Dear Editor</p> <p>The case was followed up carefully and the results were written up. however, some unclear points were found in the manuscript and these points are listed below.</p> <p>The patient has mitral valve disease and scleroderma. These two facts alone make the case interesting. Although there are some radiologic patterns for the diagnosis of venoocclusive disease, it cannot be said that this is the clear diagnosis for this patient.</p> <p>How many months after the operation the patient was catheterized is important. pulmonary artery wedge pressure is still high. without correcting this, it would not be correct to say pulmonary hypertension due to scleroderma or venoocclusive disease.</p> <p>Was scleroderma treated? In this case it is important to treat scleroderma and lung parenchymal lesions and PAB value could have decreased. There is no information on this either.</p> <p>Whether you have given specific treatment for PAH or not, you should have commented on this</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)	

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Selvi Aşkar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Yuzuncu Yil University, Turkey</b>