

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Clinical features and risk factors for primary Sjögren's syndrome combined with interstitial lung disease ريال retrospective study

Original Research, Acta Biochim. Pol.

Reviewer: Pundrik Jaiswal

Submitted on: 11 Jan 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/abp.2024.12461

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of a retrospective study aiming to analyze the clinical characteristics of primary Sjögren's syndrome (pSS) combined with interstitial lung disease (ILD) and identify risk factors associated with ILD development in pSS patients.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The MS requires some improvements which is suggested in comments

Q 3 Please comment on the methods, results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

In abstract,

- 1) Provide a brief explanation of why analyzing the clinical characteristics of pSS with ILD is important. Additionally, briefly describe the retrospective study design to enhance the reader's understanding.
- 2) Ensure that the language is clear and accessible to a broad audience, including those who may not be experts in the field.
- 3) Consider including a sentence in the conclusion that briefly discusses the clinical implications of the findings. How can this research impact patient care or future studies?

By addressing these points, the abstract can become more reader-friendly and ensure that both experts and non-experts can grasp the key findings and significance of the study.

In Introduction,

The introduction provides an overview of the background and significance of studying primary Sjögren's syndrome (pSS) with a focus on interstitial lung disease (ILD). However, there are some areas that can be improved:

- 1) The introduction is informative but can be made more concise and streamlined. Consider rephrasing sentences for better flow and clarity.
- 2) The phrase "which is reported as follows" at the end of the introduction is redundant. It's better to directly transition to the Methods section without such phrases.

Overall, it is suggested to make the introduction more focused, concise, and compelling, setting the stage for the detailed analysis presented in the rest of the paper.

Results:

Consider reorganizing the discussion for better flow. It is suggested to group related findings together and discuss them in a logical sequence.

In results,

provide more context and interpretation for findings. For example, explain the rationale behind the increased leukocyte counts in the pSS-ILD group and why this might be relevant to the pathogenesis of ILD. Similarly, discuss the potential reasons for the elevated TG and TC in the pSS-ILD group.

Some information is repeated within the discussion. Avoid unnecessary repetition to maintain conciseness.

It is suggested to add one or more sentences as: What specific aspects of the study could be explored in future research? Provide more guidance for researchers interested in building upon this work.

In conclusion,

Consider adding a sentence or two about potential future directions for research based on the current findings. Are there specific aspects that warrant further investigation? This can enhance the conclusion by providing a bridge to future studies.

Check List

Q 4 ➤ Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List)

See my comments on Q3 checklist.

Q 5 ➤ Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Q 6 ➤ Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 7 ➤ Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

Q 8 ➤ Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes.

Q 9 ➤ Are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?

Yes.

Q 10 ➤ Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository? (Sequence/expression data, protein/molecule characterizations, annotations, and taxonomy data are required to be deposited in public repositories prior to publication)

Not Applicable.

Q 11 Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?

Yes.

Q 12 Have standard biosecurity and institutional safety procedures been adhered to?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Originality

<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>
-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Q 14 Rigor

<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>
-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Q 15 Significance to the field

<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>
-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Q 16 Interest to general audience

<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>
-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Q 17 Quality of the writing

<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>
-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Q 18 Overall quality of the study

<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>
-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------