

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57332

Title: Case Report Ehler Danlos Rare Cause of Pulmonary Hypertension

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality				✓
Clarity				✓
Significance			✓	

Reviewer's ID: JPR-198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript presents a rare case of Ehlers–Danlos syndrome (EDS) associated with pulmonary hypertension. While the topic is potentially interesting, the manuscript in its current form has serious issues in language, structure, and scientific rigor, which limit its suitability for publication. Major revision is required.

Major Comments

- Language and Readability** - The manuscript contains extensive grammatical errors, incorrect terminology, and unclear sentence construction throughout. This significantly affects comprehension and requires thorough professional editing.
- Case Description and Clarity** - The case presentation is detailed but poorly organized. Clinical information is scattered and sometimes repetitive. A clearer structure (history → examination → investigations → diagnosis → management → outcome) is needed.
- Diagnostic Justification** - The diagnosis of EDS is based mainly on the Beighton score without genetic confirmation. The classification as “overlap type” is not clearly justified. Similarly, pulmonary hypertension diagnosis relies on echocardiography without gold-standard confirmation (right heart catheterization).

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Overinterpretation of Findings** - The claim of a causal or significant association between EDS and pulmonary hypertension is not adequately supported. The discussion includes speculative explanations without strong evidence.
5. **Discussion Quality** - The discussion lacks depth and critical analysis. It does not adequately compare the case with existing literature or explain the uniqueness of this case beyond geographic reporting.
6. **Figures and Clinical Images** - Images (pages 5–8) are included but lack proper labeling, description, and relevance in the text. Their clinical significance should be clearly explained.

Minor Comments

1. Multiple spelling errors (e.g., “Ehler Danlos,” “hetrogenous,” “pendepnea”).
2. Inconsistent terminology and formatting throughout.
3. Redundant or unnecessary background details (e.g., long classification list).
4. References are inconsistently formatted.
5. Abbreviations should be defined properly at first use.
6. Units and symbols (e.g., mmHg, %) should be standardized.