

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_126720
Title of the Manuscript:	Complex Interplay of Cardiac, Hepatic, and Renal dysfunction in a patient with Extra-Hepatic Portal Vein Obstruction and Rheumatic Mitral Stenosis: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Complexity and Relevance: The report effectively highlights the interconnectedness of cardiac, hepatic, and renal dysfunctions, an area of significant clinical interest. The focus on conditions such as EHPVO, DCLD, and RHD with severe mitral stenosis is pertinent and provides valuable insights for clinicians managing such complex cases. Detailed Clinical Presentation: The inclusion of comprehensive patient history, physical examination findings, and laboratory data enhances the depth of the report. This level of detail helps in understanding the multifaceted nature of the patient's condition. Discussion on Pathophysiology: The explanation of the cardio-hepato-renal axis and its relevance to the case is insightful. It reflects a thorough understanding of how dysfunction in one organ system can propagate and exacerbate issues in others. Management Insights: The report outlines both pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic management strategies, showcasing a multi-disciplinary approach to treating complex cases. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title of article would be better. My suggestions are</p> <p>“Interplay of Cardiac, Hepatic, and Renal Functions: The Impact of Portal Hypertension on Multi-Organ Systems”</p> <p>“Approach to Multi-Organ Dysfunction: Combined Effects of EHPVO and Rheumatic Heart Disease”</p> <p>“Integrated Management Strategies for Multi-Organ Failure from EHPVO and Mitral Stenosis”</p> <p>“Cardio-Hepato-Renal Axis Disorder: A Rare Presentation of EHPVO and Rheumatic Mitral Stenosis”</p> <p>“Managing Multi-Organ Dysfunction: The Challenges of Portal Hypertension and Mitral Stenosis”</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Novelty and Contribution: While the case is well-documented, the report could benefit from highlighting novel diagnostic or therapeutic approaches. It would be valuable to know if there were any innovative practices or lessons learned that could be applied to future cases. Literature Comparison: Adding more direct comparisons to existing case reports or studies would contextualize the report's findings within the broader medical literature. This helps readers understand how common or unique this presentation and management approach are. Clarity in Discussion: While the discussion is comprehensive, it could be streamlined for better clarity. Focusing more on summarizing the key points and implications without reiterating the details of the case would enhance readability. Visuals and Data Representation: The case report could be improved by including more visual aids such as flow charts, imaging studies, or summary tables of management strategies. These elements would make the information more digestible and engaging. Future Directions: The report could be strengthened by adding a section on future research implications or questions that arose from managing this case. This would broaden the appeal to researchers looking for avenues to explore. Consistency in Terminology: Ensure consistent use of medical terminology throughout the document to avoid confusion. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>it is written above paragraph</p>	
<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>This case report makes a significant contribution by detailing a rare and complex interplay of cardiac, hepatic, and renal dysfunctions. However, emphasizing novel insights, integrating comparative literature analysis, and adding visual elements would enhance its impact. Additionally, revising the discussion to be more concise and highlighting future directions for clinical research would make the report more robust and compelling.</p> <p>These suggestions aim to align the report more closely with the standards expected in high-impact medical journals.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>references should be enhanced</p>	

Review Form 3

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>While this case report addresses an important and complex interplay of cardiac, hepatic, and renal dysfunctions, it falls short in offering substantial new insights or significant contributions to the existing body of literature. The detailed presentation and management strategies are commendable; however, they largely echo previously documented cases and established approaches. The lack of novel findings or unique perspectives limits the report's potential impact and its value for publication. As such, while the effort to highlight multi-organ management is appreciated, this case may not meet the criteria for significant contribution to the current medical literature.</p> <p>1. Clinical Relevance - Evaluation: The report addresses the complex interplay between cardiac, hepatic, and renal dysfunctions, which is clinically important. However, similar cases have been extensively documented in the literature. - Score: 4/10</p> <p>2. Novelty and Contribution - Evaluation: While the report details a rare clinical scenario, it does not provide significant new insights or contributions to the existing literature. - Score: 3/10</p> <p>3. Scientific Depth and Analysis - Evaluation: The explanations of pathophysiological mechanisms and inter-organ interactions are thorough, showcasing a good level of scientific depth. However, similar analyses are present in prior studies. - Score: 4/10</p> <p>4. Writing and Presentation - Evaluation: The text is generally clear and well-written, presenting information in a systematic and logical manner. - Score: 6/10</p> <p>5. Use of References and Literature Integration Evaluation: The report appropriately references significant sources, but it could benefit from more comparative analysis and integration with the broader literature. Score: 5/10</p> <p>6. Visuals and Data Representation Evaluation: The report includes limited visuals and data representation. Adding more visual aids could strengthen the presentation of the findings. Score: 4/10</p> <p>7. Depth of Discussion and Conclusions Evaluation: The discussion section is comprehensive but does not offer novel information or unique perspectives. The conclusions are clear but have limited impact on the existing body of work. Score: 5/10</p> <p>Overall Assessment The report is well-structured and addresses a significant clinical scenario. However, its potential impact for publication is limited due to the existence of similar cases in the literature.</p>	

Review Form 3

	Average Score: 5/10 Of course, here's the revised evaluation in English with scores on a scale of 1 to 10:	
--	--	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oğuz Öztürk
Department, University & Country	Ankara Bilkent City Hospital, Turkey