

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**Manuscript No.: IJAR-57913**

**Title: Pleural and Cutaneous Manifestations of Seronegative Kaposi's Sarcoma in an Elderly Patient: A Diagnostic Challenge Resolved by Thoracoscopy,**

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

Accept after minor revision.....

**Accept after major revision .....YES**

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

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

**Reviewer's ID: JPR-094**

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

#### ### Reviewer's Report

**\*\*Manuscript Title:\*\* \*Pleural and Cutaneous Manifestations of Seronegative Kaposi's Sarcoma in an Elderly Patient: A Diagnostic Challenge Resolved by Thoracoscopy\***

#### #### Strengths

1. Presents a rare and clinically interesting case of pleural Kaposi's sarcoma in an HIV-negative elderly patient.
2. Demonstrates the diagnostic value of medical thoracoscopy when conventional investigations are inconclusive.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. Clinical presentation, radiological findings, and diagnostic workup are described in a logical sequence.
4. The case highlights an important differential diagnosis for exudative pleural effusion.
5. Educational value for pulmonologists, oncologists, thoracic surgeons, and pathologists.

### #### Weaknesses

1. Histopathological confirmation lacks immunohistochemical evidence (HHV-8 LANA-1, CD31, CD34, D2-40), which is considered important for definitive diagnosis.
2. No histopathology images or microscopic figures are provided.
3. The discussion is largely descriptive and lacks comparison with previously reported HIV-negative pleural KS cases.
4. Follow-up information, treatment strategy, and patient outcome are absent.
5. Ethical approval and patient consent statements are missing.
6. Several grammatical and language issues require professional editing.
7. The manuscript repeatedly states thoracoscopy as the "gold standard" without sufficient supporting references.
8. Limited literature review reduces the scientific impact of the case report.

### #### Key Points

1. Rare occurrence of pleural Kaposi's sarcoma in a seronegative patient.
2. Clinical presentation mimicked tuberculosis and pleural malignancy.
3. Conventional pleural biopsy and bronchoscopy failed to establish diagnosis.
4. Medical thoracoscopy enabled direct visualization and targeted biopsy.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**5. Histopathology confirmed classic Kaposi's sarcoma.**

### #### Significance

- \* The manuscript contributes to awareness of atypical manifestations of classic Kaposi's sarcoma.
- \* It emphasizes the importance of detailed skin examination in unexplained pleural effusions.
- \* The report has educational and diagnostic significance, particularly in regions where tuberculosis is prevalent and may confound diagnosis.
- \* The rarity of pleural involvement in HIV-negative patients makes the case noteworthy, though the scientific impact is limited by insufficient pathological and follow-up data.

### ### Recommendation

**\*\*Major Revision\*\***

### #### Reasons for Major Revision

1. Add immunohistochemical confirmation (HHV-8, CD31, CD34, D2-40) or explain why it was unavailable.
2. Include histopathology and thoracoscopic images with proper legends.
3. Expand literature review and compare findings with previously published cases.
4. Provide treatment details, follow-up duration, and clinical outcome.
5. Add patient consent and ethical considerations.
6. Improve English language, grammar, and formatting.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**7. Strengthen discussion with evidence-based references supporting diagnostic conclusions.**

**\*\*Final Recommendation:\*\* \*\*Major Revision Required Before Consideration for Publication.\*\***

### Detailed Justification for Major Revision (Line-by-Line Issues)

| Line No. | Issue Identified                                                                  | Reason for Major Revision                                                                                |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4–10     | Background lacks epidemiological statistics on HIV-negative pleural KS            | The rarity claim is not supported by incidence/prevalence data or recent literature.                     |
| 11–24    | Abstract presents diagnosis as definitive without mentioning immunohistochemistry | Histopathology alone may not be sufficient to confirm KS; HHV-8 immunostaining is considered diagnostic. |
| 25–29    | "Medical thoracoscopy remains the gold standard"                                  | Strong claim requires supporting evidence and references.                                                |
| 30       | Keywords are limited                                                              | Important indexing terms such as "HHV-8" and "Thoracoscopic biopsy" are absent.                          |
| 33–55    | Introduction lacks recent literature review                                       | Only basic background is provided; no discussion of current evidence regarding seronegative pleural KS.  |
| 52–55    | Claim of rarity without literature comparison                                     | Authors should summarize previously reported similar cases and explain novelty.                          |
| 58–65    | Weight loss described as "substantial unquantified"                               | Quantification is required for clinical relevance.                                                       |
| 66–69    | Incomplete medical history                                                        | Comorbidities, occupational exposures, family history, and immunological evaluation need expansion.      |
| 77–80    | Cutaneous lesions described but no dermatopathological confirmation provided      | Skin biopsy findings are absent.                                                                         |
| 82–88    | Laboratory investigations incomplete                                              | ESR, LDH, liver function, renal function, HHV-8 testing not reported.                                    |
| 89–92    | Dermoscopy findings presented                                                     | Diagnostic significance should be                                                                        |

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

| Line No. | Issue Identified                                                        | Reason for Major Revision                                                                                         |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|          | without image quality assessment                                        | supported by images and literature.                                                                               |
| 97–104   | Radiological findings lack actual CT images                             | Figures are essential in a case report describing unusual pleural masses.                                         |
| 105      | Diagnostic summary table formatting is poor                             | Table structure is incomplete and requires professional formatting.                                               |
| 106–114  | Pleural fluid analysis incomplete                                       | Protein level, LDH, glucose, pH and Light's criteria not reported.                                                |
| 115–118  | Bronchoscopy findings inadequately described                            | Histology and rationale for biopsy sites are missing.                                                             |
| 123–130  | Thoracoscopic findings not illustrated                                  | Thoracoscopic images would significantly strengthen diagnostic evidence.                                          |
| 131–135  | Histopathology description incomplete                                   | No immunohistochemical markers (HHV-8 LANA-1, CD31, CD34, D2-40) reported. This is a major scientific deficiency. |
| 135      | Diagnosis declared definitive                                           | Definitive diagnosis of KS generally requires histopathology plus immunohistochemical confirmation.               |
| 138–149  | Discussion largely repeats textbook knowledge                           | Limited critical analysis of the present case.                                                                    |
| 142–143  | Statement "visceral involvement occurs in less than 10%" lacks citation | Numerical claims require references.                                                                              |
| 146–149  | Association with agriculture is speculative                             | Causality cannot be inferred from a single case.                                                                  |
| 150–155  | Pathogenesis discussion speculative                                     | Elevated CRP cannot be linked directly to KS pathogenesis without evidence.                                       |
| 156–175  | Discussion lacks comparison with previous case reports                  | Authors should compare clinical presentation, diagnosis, and outcomes with published cases.                       |
| 169–175  | Thoracoscopy emphasized but diagnostic yield not discussed              | Literature on sensitivity and specificity should be cited.                                                        |
| 177–186  | Conclusion overstates findings from a single case                       | Generalizations should be tempered.                                                                               |
| 187–201  | Reference list limited (6 references only)                              | Insufficient literature support for a rare disease report.                                                        |
| 202–210  | Figure legends included but                                             | Figures are essential for publication of a                                                                        |

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

| Line No.          | Issue Identified                     | Reason for Major Revision                                                                        |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                   | figures absent                       | diagnostic case report.                                                                          |
| Entire manuscript | No patient consent statement         | Mandatory requirement for case reports.                                                          |
| Entire manuscript | No ethics approval/declaration       | Required according to most journal policies.                                                     |
| Entire manuscript | No treatment details provided        | Reader cannot assess management approach.                                                        |
| Entire manuscript | No follow-up outcome reported        | Clinical outcome is a key component of a case report.                                            |
| Entire manuscript | Language and grammar require editing | Multiple stylistic issues, repetition, and overly descriptive wording reduce scientific clarity. |

### *Why Major Revision Instead of Minor Revision?*

#### Major scientific deficiencies:

**Absence of immunohistochemical confirmation (HHV-8/CD31/CD34).**

**No treatment and follow-up data.**

**No pathology or thoracoscopy figures.**

**Insufficient literature review and comparison with previous cases.**

**Missing patient consent and ethical statements.**

**Incomplete diagnostic workup reporting.**

These deficiencies affect the **scientific validity, reproducibility, and publishability** of the case report and therefore cannot be corrected through simple editorial changes.

#### Reviewer Recommendation

**Decision: Major Revision**

**Overall Recommendation:** Major Revision Required Before Acceptance.