

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_123253</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Rare Presentation of Pulmonary Arterial Hypertension as an Initial Manifestation of Systemic Lupus Erythematosus in a young girl</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Importance of differential diagnosis in Clinical practice and how to reach final diagnosis to give the perfect ttt	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Pulmonary hyper tension as first preasntation for systemic lupus in young adult	
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.	Yes it is Perfect	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Rare presentation	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Need more recent reference since 2019 till now	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Need more differential diagnosis and mention it in introduction and case presentatiom	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohamed Elsayed Saleh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Zagazig University, Egypt</b>