

### 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	<b>Case Report</b>

#### **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>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.	It can be difficult to distinguish between pulmonary hypertension and primary pulmonary artery hypertension in young people. Since many people are thought to have PH as a result of structural heart disorders, which delays diagnosis and treatment, many patients with PPH remain underdiagnosed. To enable prompt diagnosis and treatment, every patient who presents with a suspicion of pulmonary hypertension should have a thorough workup completed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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	
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.	Diagnosing primary pulmonary hypertension (PPH) and sinus venosus ASD in younger patients is a significant challenge. The diagnosis of pulmonary hypertension (PH) in younger patients remains a significant diagnostic challenge. This is a unique instance of a young girl who first appeared to have a probable sinus venosus atrial septal defect (ASD) with Eisenmengerization. However, after extensive testing, it was discovered that the girl actually had PH with SLE.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. Discussion Part needs addition of few references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>Richa Rathoria</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>