

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_106112
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Radiology on the Early Identification of Waterhouse-Friderichsen Syndrome: A Case Study
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>In this paper, the authors present the impact of radiology on the early identification of Waterhouse-Friderichsen Syndrome. It describes the relevance of radiology, such as CT or MRI scans, in the diagnosis of this rare disease. The subject is of great interest and can be seen as a new lead to a quicker and better diagnosis of WFS.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable for its content.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive and provides sufficient information on the subject. The introduction focuses on the general knowledge on the subject. The information provided is up-to-date and useful in understanding the topic and the importance of the subject in nowadays medicine.</p> <p>The methods used are complex and reliable.</p> <p>The inclusion and exclusion criteria were wisely chosen.</p> <p>The authors conducted a proper collection of the data. The information presented is up to date, suitable, and substantial.</p> <p>The conclusions are coherent and sustain the findings.</p> <p>The figures presented are easy to interpret and understand.</p> <p>I recommend it for publication.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Good English level.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihai Dumitrascu
Department, University & Country	Carol Davila" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, University Emergency Hospital, Romania