

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_125109
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Hemophilic Pseudotumors: A Comprehensive Case Series
Type of the Article	Case study

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it addresses a rare but clinically significant complication of hemophilia – hemophilic pseudotumors. However, the small sample size and the lack of detailed outcome measures limit its impact. Addressing these gaps could strengthen the manuscript's relevance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Exploring Hemophilic Pseudotumors: A Comprehensive Case Series," is suitable but could be refined to better reflect the scope and limitations. I suggest an alternative: "Management of Hemophilic Pseudotumors in Resource-Limited Settings: A Case Series."	
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.	The abstract provides a decent overview of the manuscript, but it lacks details on the clinical and patient-reported outcomes used to assess management effectiveness. I recommend adding a brief mention of the objective measures (e.g., quality of life, mobility) and a note about the small sample size, which limits generalizability. The aim of the study is to highlight the prevalence of hemophilic pseudotumor complications, yet the conclusion primarily focuses on surgical management. Given the limited number of cases (four), it is difficult to draw significant conclusions about prevalence. The authors should either adjust the aim to align with the study's scope or provide more robust data on the prevalence of complications.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, but the methods section should include more details on how cases were selected and the criteria for choosing conservative versus surgical management. Additionally, it would benefit from a section on long-term outcomes and complications monitoring. The manuscript alludes to financial constraints as a barrier to treatment but does not provide objective measures to quantify this. Were there any assessments or surveys regarding the financial impact on patients, or was this based on anecdotal evidence? Including demographic or socioeconomic data would add validity to this claim. The discussion should provide more explicit recommendations for future research.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	While the manuscript is scientifically sound in its overall approach, several key details need further clarification. The lack of information on whether patients were on prophylactic factor replacement therapy before the interventions is a significant gap, as it could influence the course of the pseudotumors. The absence of details on the objective assessment of functional limitations and patient-reported outcomes also weakens the findings. To improve scientific rigor, these details, along with more robust follow-up data, should be included. In India, some centers offer free factor concentrates. The authors should clarify if their center is part of this initiative and explain how this affects the management of patients in the case series. The manuscript briefly mentions surgery-related complications but lacks a long-term plan for monitoring potential complications such as inhibitor development. This could be a significant oversight, and it would be beneficial to discuss how the authors plan to track these risks in the long run. The manuscript mentions the use of Anti-Hemophilic Factor (AHF) but lacks specific details on dosing protocols.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are mostly adequate but could be enhanced by adding more recent literature on hemophilic pseudotumor management, particularly regarding radiotherapy and arterial embolization. Incorporating comparative data with other case series would help contextualize the findings within global practices.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas where clarity could be improved. Simplifying overly complex sentences and reducing medical jargon in certain sections would make the manuscript more accessible.	
Optional/General comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Including baseline characteristics (e.g., age, BMI, comorbidities) in a summary table would provide a clearer understanding of the patient cohort and improve the manuscript's overall clarity. <input type="checkbox"/> The manuscript would benefit from more explicit consideration of how long-term complications such as inhibitor development will be monitored, as this is a critical aspect of patient care. <input type="checkbox"/> A flowchart or graphical summary showing the clinical management pathway and outcomes could enhance reader engagement and provide a visual representation of the treatment process.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Akanksha Nagar
Department, University & Country	Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, India