

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_130762
Title of the Manuscript:	FIBRODYSPLASIA OSSIFICANS PROGRESSIVA OR MUNCHMEYER'S DISEASE : A CASE REPORT
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a detailed case report of late-onset Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva (FOP), a rare and severely debilitating genetic condition. The paper offers insights into the clinical progression and radiological features of FOP, which can aid clinicians in recognizing this challenging disease early, especially in atypical cases. Additionally, the report emphasizes the importance of genetic research in diagnosing and understanding rare diseases, particularly with the discovery of ACVR1 mutations. The discussion of management strategies, or the lack thereof, also underlines the need for continued research into therapeutic interventions for FOP.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes , the title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focuses on the main subject of the case report—Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva (FOP). However, the alternative title could be: <i>“Late-Onset Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva (FOP) or Munchmeyer’s Disease: A Case Report and Review of Clinical and Radiological Features”</i> This slight revision maintains clarity while highlighting the focus on late-onset FOP, which is central to the manuscript.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive, though it could benefit from a bit more specificity regarding the patient's disease progression, such as how the condition evolved over time and what the critical findings were in this particular case. Currently, it briefly touches on the key points, but expanding it with a sentence or two about the timeline of symptom onset and disease progression would give readers a clearer overview of the case. Here's a suggestion for a more detailed abstract:</p> <p><i>"We report a case of a 37-year-old female patient with late-onset Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva (FOP), presenting with disabling ankylosis and progressive heterotopic ossification since adolescence following trauma. The report outlines the clinical, radiological, and evolutionary aspects of FOP, with a focus on the diagnosis through classic congenital malformations of the toes and progressive ossification patterns. The paper underscores the challenges of managing such a rare disease, where early diagnosis and genetic confirmation are crucial for prognosis."</i></p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically accurate. The description of the disease's progression, radiological findings, and clinical manifestations align with the current understanding of Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva. The inclusion of genetic information, such as the mutation in the ACVR1 gene, is accurate and relevant. However, the manuscript could mention recent advances in treatment or drug trials (such as palovarotene) to add depth to the discussion regarding management.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are generally adequate; however, some could be more recent, particularly with regard to treatment advancements. The references from the early 2000s and late 1990s, while foundational, could be supplemented with more recent studies, especially those exploring new pharmacological treatments or the role of genetic research. Some suggestions for additional references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kaplan, F. S., & Shore, E. M. (2016). <i>The role of palovarotene in the treatment of Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva</i>. <i>New England Journal of Medicine</i>, 374(11), 1056-1065.• Pignolo, R. J., & Shore, E. M. (2019). <i>Current understanding and management of Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva</i>. <i>Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases</i>, 14(1), 1-8. <p>These references would provide a more comprehensive view of both the clinical and research aspects of FOP.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality are suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is generally clear, but some sentences could be streamlined for better readability. Additionally, a few minor grammatical improvements could be made to improve the flow of the manuscript. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "The patient was 37 years old and had no previous pathological history" could be rephrased to "The patient, a 37-year-old female with no significant medical history, presented with ankylosis..."• "The evolution was marked by the appearance of other ossified nodosities affecting various muscles" could be clearer if rewritten as "The disease progressed with the development of additional ossified nodules affecting various muscles."	

Review Form 3

Optional/General comments	<div><div><div><div><div></div><div>Clarity and Flow</div></div><div>The manuscript can be improved by reorganizing the information in some sections to ensure a more logical flow. For instance, the case report could more clearly outline the sequence of events in the patient's history before discussing the radiological findings and diagnosis.</div></div></div><div><div><div><div></div><div>Additional Insights</div></div><div>Given the rarity of FOP, it would be helpful to provide some insights or suggestions for clinicians who may encounter such a case, even though no specific curative treatment exists. For example, offering recommendations for managing flare-ups, pain control, or respiratory issues could provide practical utility for the scientific community.</div></div></div><div><div><div><div></div><div>Figure Captions</div></div><div>The figure captions could be more detailed. For instance, specifying the anatomical locations of the heterotopic ossifications in the radiographs could help clarify the extent of disease involvement.</div></div></div><div>No, there are no apparent ethical issues in this manuscript. The manuscript clearly mentions that written consent has been obtained from the patient, as per international and university standards. Additionally, the ethical approval was exempted by the Ethical Committee at Ibn Roch University Hospital, which is standard practice for case reports involving rare conditions like Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva (FOP), where patient anonymity and privacy are strictly protected. The patient's identity is not disclosed, and there are no identifiable personal details, which is appropriate for ethical guidelines in medical publishing.</div><div>However, I would suggest that the Ethical Approval section could be further clarified to explicitly mention that the patient's identity was anonymized and that the images used in the manuscript were properly de-identified. A more detailed description of how the patient's confidentiality was ensured could strengthen the manuscript's ethical compliance.</div><div>No, there are no competing interest issues mentioned in the manuscript. The author(s) have not disclosed any financial, professional, or personal conflicts of interest related to the research or case report. The absence of competing interests is consistent with the transparency required in scholarly publications.</div><div>If there are any potential conflicts of interest, such as involvement in pharmaceutical trials, collaborations with FOP-related research organizations, or financial support from external sources, these should be explicitly mentioned. If no such conflicts exist, it is appropriate to state this clearly in the manuscript.</div><div>No plagiarism has been identified in this manuscript. Based on the provided text, the content appears original and appropriately references other works in the field. The case report follows standard practices for scientific writing, including proper citation of relevant studies.</div></div>	
---------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Usha Eswaran
Department, University & Country	California University FCE, USA