

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_129608
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO GUILLAIN-BARRE SYNDROME: A CASE REPORT
Type of the Article	Case report

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>Dear Editor,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript titled " A Comprehensive Approach To Guillain-Barre Syndrome: A Case Report" (manuscript number: Ms_IJMPCR_129608) submitted to International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports. I commend the authors for addressing an important and clinically significant topic like Guillain-Barré Syndrome in their case report. The study offers valuable insights, particularly regarding treatment management and patient outcomes. However, I believe there are areas where the manuscript could be strengthened to enhance its scientific content and presentation.</p> <p>Below, I have provided my general comments and detailed suggestions. I hope the authors will find these recommendations helpful in revising their work to make it more robust and impactful.</p> <p>Major Comments and Suggestions</p> <p>Comment 1: Repetition and lack of purpose in the Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unnecessary repetitions: Statements regarding incidence and IVIG treatment are repeated unnecessarily. For example, the following sentences convey the same information:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ "Globally, the incidence rate of Guillain-Barré Syndrome (GBS) is approximately 0.001% to 0.002% of the population annually, or 1-2 cases per 100,000 people. This translates to about 1 to 2 individuals affected for every 100,000 people each year."○ "The typical dosage is 0.4 g/kg daily for five days, with similar effectiveness if given over two days."• Revision: These statements should be streamlined, and repetitions should be avoided. Additionally, the purpose of the case report should be clearly stated at the end of the introduction.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Example: "This case highlights the successful management and rehabilitation of an elderly patient diagnosed with Guillain-Barré Syndrome through a combination of plasmapheresis and IVIG therapy." <p>Comment 2: Excessive details on corticosteroid therapy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The ineffectiveness of corticosteroids has been discussed at length, but this information is not directly relevant to the case and unnecessarily complicates the introduction.• Revision: This discussion should be moved to the literature discussion section or omitted entirely. <p>Comment 3: Lack of context for choosing plasmapheresis and IVIG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revision: The rationale for choosing plasmapheresis and IVIG in the treatment sequence should be explained in relation to the patient's clinical condition. For instance:	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ "In this patient, plasmapheresis was selected as the initial treatment due to the presence of significant bulbar involvement or the need for mechanical ventilation."• The rationale for this treatment sequence should be supported by references from the literature. <p>Comment 4: Relevance of imaging findings to case management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revision: The lumbar and cervical findings should be clearly stated as not directly related to GBS. Additionally, spinal MRI findings should clarify whether features supporting GBS, such as cauda equina enhancement, were present. If absent, this should be explicitly mentioned.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Example: "No cauda equina enhancement was observed on spinal MRI." <p>Comment 5: Table adjustments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Treatment dates in the table make it unnecessarily detailed.• Revision: A concise description such as "Five sessions of plasmapheresis were administered daily or every other day" would suffice. Simplifying or removing Table 2 can make the information more accessible to the reader. <p>Comment 6: Excessive details on urinary infection treatment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revision: The details about urinary tract infection treatment should be reduced. It is sufficient to state that the infection responded to treatment.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Example: "The patient's urinary tract infection was successfully treated with appropriate antibiotics." <p>Comment 7: Objective evaluation of the patient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Suggestion: Objective scoring systems such as mEGOS, EGOS, GBS Disability Score, or MRS should be used. These scoring systems can add an additional layer of objectivity to assess the effectiveness of treatment in the case report. <p>Comment 8: Role of electrophysiological subtyping in treatment selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The role of electrophysiological subtyping in treatment selection is not well established in the literature. The report's claim of superiority of combined plasmapheresis and IVIG therapy over IVIG or plasmapheresis alone is certainly insufficient with a single case.• Revision: "The motor axonal variant in this patient highlights the need for further studies to	
--	---	--

	<p>evaluate the effectiveness of combined plasmapheresis and IVIG therapy."</p> <p>Comment 9: Lack of clarity on the case's uniqueness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The case does not clearly establish what makes it distinct from other GBS cases.Revision: The case should emphasize its unique aspects, such as age, clinical course, or response to treatment.<ul style="list-style-type: none">Example: "This case represents a rare instance of successful combined plasmapheresis and IVIG therapy in an elderly patient with Guillain-Barré Syndrome."If the case has a specific subtype or atypical presentation, this should be highlighted. Otherwise, the case lacks distinctiveness compared to other reports. <p>Comment 10: Inconsistent abbreviations and formatting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The inconsistent use of abbreviations, particularly Guillain-Barré Syndrome (GBS), throughout the manuscript affects readability. There are also minor formatting issues, such as inconsistent spacing after punctuation and irregular italicization of scientific terms.Revision: Ensure uniform formatting and consistent use of abbreviations throughout the manuscript. These adjustments will improve the overall presentation and align it with the standards expected in the journal. <p>Comment 11: Language and Writing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The language of the manuscript is scientific but occasionally includes complex expressions. Simpler and more fluent language could improve readability.Suggestion: Long and complex sentences should be simplified. <p>Comment 12: Expansion of the Discussion Section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The discussion section is brief and superficial. Topics such as the response of different GBS subtypes to treatment and the impact of age on prognosis could be addressed.Suggestion: The discussion could be expanded by referencing studies on the course of GBS in elderly patients. For example: "Studies in the literature report that GBS cases in elderly patients tend to have a prolonged recovery period and a higher likelihood of requiring intensive care." <p>In conclusion, I appreciate the opportunity to review this manuscript. While the study addresses a significant topic and provides valuable insights, I believe the suggested revisions will help improve its clarity, scientific rigor, and overall impact. I hope the authors find the feedback constructive and helpful</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 3

	for enhancing their work. Thank you once again for considering my comments. Sincerely.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer’s comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yavuz Atas
Department, University & Country	Medical School of Firat University, Turkiye