

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. The manuscript is important for the scientific community. It highlights an important clinical condition that needs urgent attention.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract needs refinement. There are plenty grammatical mistakes. The gender of the patient is not consistent. Kindly rectify these errors. Abstract needs to cover concise information about the case and discussion. It seems to be abruptly cut off.</p> <p>Yes. Introduction is repetitive and needs to be cut short. 2-3 paragraphs are similar in meaning. Repeated references to the female patient as “ he “ needs to be rectified. Tense of the sentences is continuously varying. Stick to one tense : present or past !</p> <p>Rectification : 3.2 Discussion. What is point 3.1 ? The manuscript needs to give a detailed information about the imaging done and its significance. Reliance on laboratory tests has been highlighted. Role of imaging needs to be explained in much more detail. There has been pasting of information from the said references in bits and pieces. The author needs to summarize better and not just enlist the information from the references. Merits of the case have been mentioned in the first 2 paragraphs of the discussion. These need to be in the conclusion ! Discussion should be strictly adhering to the present case, Compared with the multiple references, the role of imaging and how imaging was relevant and useful. Merits of the case have been repeatedly highlighted which is unnecessary.</p> <p>“ In conclusion, this case provides valuable insight into the role of radiology in the early identification of WFS. Despite the rarity of the syndrome, clinicians should be alert to the possibility of its occurrence in patients with similar symptoms and make effective use of available imaging tools to facilitate early diagnosis and appropriate treatment. [15, 16]</p> <p>4. Conclusion “ - conclusion header is preceded by concluding in discussion : its inappropriate.</p> <p>Yes. References are sufficient. However, references 19,20 have not been mentioned in the manuscript ! What is the reason for not utilising these OR why have these been mentioned if not referred to !</p> <p>Consent is incomplete. Kindly attach consent document.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No; needs major rectification.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Kindly utilise Spellcheck or Grammarly for better English quality.</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:	Saket Sanjeev Patwardhan
Department, University & Country	Kulkarni Urosurgery Institute, India