

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53863

Date: 15/09/2025

Title: **Comparative Clinical Perspectives on Situs Inversus with and without Kartagener's Syndrome**

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Dr. S. K. Nath

Date: 16/09/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

This paper sheds light on the clinical heterogeneity of situs inversus totalis, highlighting the importance of careful diagnosis and multidisciplinary management. Its strength lies in detailed case descriptions and highlighting the spectrum from benign anatomical variants to syndromic associations like Kartagener's syndrome. To strengthen the manuscript, expanding sample size, clarifying language, and polishing references will be beneficial.

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Strengths:

- Comprehensive Case Comparison:** The paper effectively contrasts two distinct cases of situs inversus, providing valuable insights into their clinical spectrum, associated syndromes like Kartagener's, and incidental findings such as congenital heart defects. This enhances understanding of the heterogeneity of the condition.
- Clinical and Diagnostic Detail:** The inclusion of detailed clinical presentations, imaging findings, and associated anomalies exemplifies thorough clinical evaluation and emphasizes multidisciplinary approaches.
- Literature Integration:** The paper references relevant previous studies and literature, strengthening its background and contextual importance.
- Educational Value:** It underscores the importance of recognizing situs inversus and its syndromic associations, guiding clinicians in diagnosis and management.

Weaknesses:

- Limited Sample Size:** As a case series, the study elaborates on only two patients. While detailed, broader implications may require more extensive data to generalize findings.
- Clarity and Flow:** Some sections, especially in the discussion and conclusion, could benefit from more structured and concise language to improve readability.
- Reference Formatting:** The references are numbered inconsistently, and some references lack complete citation details, which can detract from perceived professionalism.
- Typographical and Grammatical Errors:** Minor errors are present which could be addressed to enhance clarity and professionalism.
- Missing Data on Long-term Follow-up:** The paper does not specify ongoing management plans or long-term outcomes for the patients, which could add valuable insights.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Recommendations for the Author:

1. **Language and Grammar:** Review the manuscript for grammatical errors and proofreading. For example, ensure subject-verb agreement, correct use of tenses, and punctuation. Clarify complex sentences to improve readability.
2. **Formatting:** Standardize citation style for references consistently throughout the manuscript. Use consistent heading styles and numbering.
3. **Content Enhancements:** Add a brief discussion on long-term management and prognosis for similar cases. Include more details on follow-up and treatment outcomes if available. Possibly expand the case series or include more cases for broader applicability.
4. **Typographical Corrections:** Correct any typos or minor errors identified in the text (e.g., spacing issues, misplaced punctuation).
5. **Figures and Tables:** If applicable, include clear images or diagrams illustrating key findings described, such as imaging results, to enhance understanding.