

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77395

**Title:** Pulmonary hypertension secondary to seronegative rheumatoid arthritis overlapping antisyndetase syndrome: A case report and literature review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06299707

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-05-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-05-02 14:57

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-05-07 08:40

**Review time:** 4 Days and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting case for reporting. It is worth noting that, the discussion section is rich and well arranged, and the most parts of the manuscript has a good spelling, grammar and syntax. In addition, the majority of bibliographic citations are update. However, before it becomes publishable, it still requires some improvement. Here are my comments: 1.The background section has been duplicated from the first paragraph of the introduction, it is incomplete and does not cover all of your research ingredients, and also, the importance of your article is not prominent enough. In this section, you must create an explicit view of why you are directed to write this topic. 2.In the case summary section be specific on the patient, and what have done for this individual, not on what this case study reports and definition of scientific facts. At the last sentences of this section explain the current situation of your patient. 3.Add one more keyword in your abstract, and make sure you checked all of them on Medical Subject Headings (MeSH). 4.The constructs and concepts in the introduction section are poor-organized. Include more general and specific background in the manuscript, and use more cohesion and coherence in sentences. The aim of your study, which must come in the last sentences, been located in the middle. 5.In the introduction section, there are some sentences which been left without citation. Provide references for All the sentences which finished by dot, and make sure that the entire of manuscript follow this maxim. 6.in the final diagnosis section, you have written the initial diagnosis; substitute it with final diagnosis. Sincerely Navid Faraji

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77395

**Title:** Pulmonary hypertension secondary to seronegative rheumatoid arthritis overlapping antisyndetase syndrome: A case report and literature review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06250974

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Instructor, Lecturer, Staff Physician, Teacher

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Thailand

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-05-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-05-02 19:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-05-08 15:12

**Review time:** 5 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this work. -1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes -2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes. However, please provide the full term of this abbreviation in the Core tip: "ASS," "PAH," and "CTD." -3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes -4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes -5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Not applicable. -6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? Yes -7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Yes -8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Yes -9 Biostatistics. Not applicable. -10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes -11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? There was "[J]" after every journal title in the reference. For example, "De Stefano L, D'Onofrio B, Manzo A, et al. The Genetic, Environmental, and Immunopathological Complexity of Autoantibody-Negative Rheumatoid Arthritis[J]. Int J Mol Sci, 2021,22(22)." Please remove "[J]" in the reference. -12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Yes -13 Research methods and reporting. The CARE checklist mentions the "strengths and

limitations in your approach to this case." Therefore, please state the strengths and limitations of this case in the manuscript in the discussion section. -14 Ethics statements. Yes

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77395

**Title:** Pulmonary hypertension secondary to seronegative rheumatoid arthritis overlapping antisyndetase syndrome: A case report and literature review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05227810

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACC, FESC, MBBS, MD

**Professional title:** Additional Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-05-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-05-04 13:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-05-08 18:42

**Review time:** 4 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors describe an unusual case of PH secondary to Seronegative RA plus ASS. The case is well written and figures are legible too. Multiple Minor comments need to be addressed-

1. Please expand "IIM" in introduction section, Line 8.
2. Outcome/follow-up section, Line 3- "Cardiac ultrasonography revealed Mild PH"- Please define the source of classification of PH into mild, moderate & severe. Neither the recent ACC/AHA nor the ESC/ERS PH guidelines provide such a classification.
3. Outcome/follow-up section, Line 11- " Arpan can be relieved after regular " - the sentence doesn't make sense ..correct it!
4. "The current treatment of PAH (Anritsu Tan Tablets 5 mg bid) was" - provide generic name of Anristu Tan tablet !
5. Table 1- "Pulmonary artery pressure" - which one Mean or systolic or diastolic ?
6. Fig. 2 - Gradual widening of the pulmonary artery not appreciable in serial CT. Give Pulmonary Artery dimensions for better understanding.
7. " Sparks et al. showed that depression, especially antidepressant use, is "- Any specific antidepressants use which is more prone to develop RA ? if yes add.
8. "SNRA and depression" section can be trimmed. Not very relevant as the present case concerns regarding development of PH.
9. SNRA and ASS section, Line 4- "Radiotherapy erosion is occasionally found " - it should be "radiological erosions".
10. Why was ASS diagnosed - mention which criteria - Solomon or Connor's?
11. Reference - 14 & 16 are duplicate
12. Reference - 17 & 19 are duplicate