

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56590

Title: Idiopathic Intracranial Hypertension: Epidemiological, Clinical, and Therapeutic Characteristics in a Moroccan Tertiary Neurology Center – A Retrospective Study of 105 Patients.,

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

Accept after minor revision...YES.....

Accept after major revision .....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

| Rating         | Excel. | Good | Fair | Poor |
|----------------|--------|------|------|------|
| Originality    |        | √    |      |      |
| Techn. Quality |        |      | √    |      |
| Clarity        |        | √    |      |      |
| Significance   |        | √    |      |      |

Reviewer's ID: JPR-094

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### 1. Strengths of the Manuscript

#### 1. \*\*Relevant Clinical Topic\*\*

The manuscript addresses **Idiopathic Intracranial Hypertension (IIH)**, an important neurological disorder that may lead to permanent visual loss if untreated. The topic is clinically significant for neurologists and ophthalmologists.

#### 2. \*\*Large Sample Size for a Single-Center Study\*\*

The study includes **105 patients**, which represents a relatively large cohort for a rare neurological condition.

#### 3. \*\*Long Study Duration\*\*

The **11-year retrospective period (2010–2021)** strengthens the dataset and allows better evaluation of clinical patterns and outcomes.

#### 4. \*\*Comprehensive Clinical Data\*\*

The manuscript provides detailed information on:

\* epidemiological characteristics

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

- \* risk factors
- \* clinical presentation
- \* neuroimaging findings
- \* CSF characteristics
- \* treatment approaches
- \* patient outcomes.

### 5. **\*\*Regional Contribution\*\***

There are **\*\*limited data from North Africa\*\***, and the study contributes useful regional epidemiological information.

### 6. **\*\*Clear Organization of Sections\*\***

The manuscript follows a standard structure (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion).

## 2. **Weaknesses of the Manuscript**

### 1. **\*\*Retrospective Study Design\*\***

The retrospective nature introduces **\*\*selection bias and incomplete clinical records\*\***, which limits the strength of conclusions.

### 2. **\*\*Single-Center Study\*\***

The study was conducted in a **\*\*single tertiary hospital\*\***, which limits the **\*\*generalizability\*\*** of results to the broader population.

### 3. **\*\*Limited Statistical Analysis\*\***

Only **\*\*descriptive statistics using Microsoft Excel\*\*** were performed.

No **\*\*inferential statistics, regression analysis, or risk factor correlation\*\*** were conducted.

### 4. **\*\*Incomplete BMI Data\*\***

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Obesity is a major risk factor for IIH, yet **BMI was not available for all patients**, which weakens the analysis of metabolic risk factors.

### 5. **Limited Long-Term Follow-Up**

Long-term ophthalmological outcomes and recurrence predictors are **not extensively evaluated**.

### 6. **Reference Formatting Issues**

Several references are **poorly formatted, inconsistent, or contain typographical errors**, which reduces the manuscript's professional quality.

### 7. **Language and Formatting Problems**

Minor grammatical errors and formatting inconsistencies are present throughout the manuscript.

## 3. Significance of the Study

The study is significant because:

- \* It provides **one of the largest reported case series of IIH from Morocco and North Africa**.
- \* It highlights the **clinical presentation and risk factors associated with IIH** in this population.
- \* It emphasizes the importance of **early diagnosis and treatment to prevent visual loss**.
- \* The findings contribute to the **global literature on IIH epidemiology and management**.

## 4. Key Points of the Study

- IIH predominantly affects **young women**, with a female-to-male ratio of **10.6:1**.
- The **mean age of patients was 29.7 years**.
- Headache was present in all patients**, followed by diplopia, pulsatile tinnitus, and visual disturbances.
- Papilledema occurred in 96% of cases**.
- MRI findings** frequently included empty sella and optic nerve sheath distension.

**REVIEWER'S REPORT**

6. **Acetazolamide therapy and therapeutic lumbar puncture** were the main treatment modalities.
7. **Surgical intervention** was required in 21% of patients with severe disease.
8. **Permanent blindness** occurred in 4.7% of patients, highlighting the need for early intervention.

**5. Recommendations for Improvement**

The authors should consider the following improvements:

1. **Improve statistical analysis** by including inferential statistics and risk factor analysis.
2. **Clarify BMI data availability** and its relationship with clinical outcomes.
3. Provide **longer follow-up data**, particularly regarding visual outcomes and recurrence.
4. **Revise and standardize references** according to the journal guidelines.
5. **Improve language quality and grammar** through professional editing.
6. Provide **more detailed imaging data and figures** if available.

**6. Final Recommendation**

**Decision: Minor Revision**

The manuscript addresses an important clinical issue and provides valuable regional data on IIH. However, several methodological and formatting issues should be corrected before publication.

**Justification for Minor Revision****1. Title Section (Lines 1–3)**

**Issue:**

The title is clear but slightly long.

**Justification:**

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

The authors may consider shortening the title for conciseness while maintaining key elements of the study.

### 2. Abstract (Lines 5–37)

**\*\*Line 7–10\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Background information is adequate but could be more concise.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Reducing repetitive statements will improve readability.

**\*\*Line 15–20\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

The methods section briefly describes the study design but does not mention the statistical methods clearly.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Including the type of statistical analysis used would improve methodological transparency.

**\*\*Line 21–32\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Results are clearly presented, but some percentages lack context regarding total sample size.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Clarifying denominators for percentages will enhance clarity.

**\*\*Line 33–37\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

The conclusion is appropriate but slightly general.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Adding a brief mention of the regional significance of the findings would strengthen the conclusion.

### 3. Introduction (Lines 45–70)

**\*\*Line 46–52\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

The epidemiological background is well presented but contains some repetitive statements about incidence and obesity.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Minor editing can improve conciseness.

**\*\*Line 59–64\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Diagnostic criteria are explained clearly, but referencing could be improved.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Ensuring the most recent guideline references would strengthen the section.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**\*\*Line 65–70\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

The study objective is stated but could be more concise.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

A more focused objective statement would improve clarity.

### **4. Materials and Methods (Lines 71–105)**

**\*\*Line 73–75\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Study design is clearly mentioned but lacks detail regarding patient selection procedures.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Adding clarification on patient identification from hospital records would improve transparency.

**\*\*Line 81–85\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Data collection variables are listed clearly.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

No major issue, but minor formatting improvements could enhance readability.

**\*\*Line 95–98\*\***

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Statistical analysis is limited to descriptive statistics using Microsoft Excel.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Although acceptable for descriptive studies, mentioning specific statistical tests or software limitations would improve methodological clarity.

**\*\*Line 99–104\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Ethical approval is stated, but the description of ethical clearance is brief.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Providing the ethics approval number would strengthen the ethical reporting.

### **5. Results (Lines 106–165)**

**\*\*Line 107–111\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Demographic results are clearly presented.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

No major issue; however, the text could reference the table more clearly.

**\*\*Table 1 (Line 112–114)\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Table formatting is slightly inconsistent.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Improving formatting will enhance readability.

**\*\*Line 117–121\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

BMI information is incomplete for some patients.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Authors should clarify how many patients had available BMI data.

**\*\*Table 2\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Risk factor percentages could be clarified with denominators.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Improves transparency of data interpretation.

**\*\*Line 125–130\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Clinical presentation is described well.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Minor grammatical editing is recommended.

**\*\*Table 3\*\***

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

The table is informative but formatting could be improved.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Better alignment and consistent formatting will improve clarity.

**\*\*Line 139–148\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

MRI findings are described but quantitative frequencies are not fully provided.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Providing percentages for imaging findings would strengthen the results.

**\*\*Table 4\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Treatment outcomes are clear but require consistent formatting.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Minor formatting corrections are recommended.

### **6. Discussion (Lines 166–261)**

**\*\*Line 172–181\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Comparison with previous studies is appropriate but somewhat repetitive.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Condensing repeated explanations would improve readability.

**\*\*Line 183–190\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Pathophysiology discussion is informative.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

No major issue; minor editing may improve flow.

**\*\*Line 191–203\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Risk factors are well described.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Including stronger statistical comparisons with other studies would improve discussion strength.

**\*\*Line 204–211\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Clinical presentation discussion is appropriate.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Minor language editing required.

**\*\*Line 212–221\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Visual outcomes are discussed clearly.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Authors may emphasize predictors of poor outcomes more clearly.

**\*\*Line 230–241\*\***

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Therapeutic management discussion is adequate.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Referencing recent clinical guidelines could strengthen the discussion.

### **7. Study Limitations** (Lines 242–248)

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Limitations are clearly acknowledged.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

No major issues.

### **8. Conclusion** (Lines 264–269)

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Conclusion is appropriate but slightly general.

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

Adding a brief statement on the implications for regional healthcare systems could improve impact.

### **9. References** (Lines 294–369)

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**\*\*Issue:\*\***

Several references contain formatting inconsistencies.

Examples:

\* Missing spaces

\* Inconsistent author formatting

\* Mixed language references

**\*\*Justification:\*\***

References should be revised according to the journal citation style.

### Final Reviewer Recommendation

**\*\*Decision: Minor Revision\*\***

**\*\*Reason:\*\***

The manuscript presents valuable regional data and is generally well structured. The required revisions are mainly related to **\*\*clarity, formatting, reference style, and minor methodological clarification\*\***, which can be corrected without major restructuring of the study.