

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 article is important in order for us, the medical community, to find out what we have to do for bettering our patients quality of life. Moreover, it's important for us, those that are in countries with better access to treatment and medical knowledge(of patients), to be reminded of these rare, but important complications. Moreover, these cases are a good example of why we need to teach our patients about their disease and care.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable/	
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.	No, the abstract is suitable. No changes needed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is ok, but the appearance would need improving. Bolding the subsection titles and cases would be appreciated,as it would provide a better view of the structure and for those with poorer eyesight it's easier to find the desired section. Please review the reference section and modify the writing to be the same style in all references. It does not give a very proficient look when we have 2 types of characters. Also giving numbers to subsections might work better as well. Such as : 1. Aims, 2. Matherial and methods, etc.	
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.	The manuscript need a few changes from my point of view, in order for it to be changed: 1. The aim has not been proven in the text. You need to add some more data about the number of hemophilia patients in your country and center. Since you are presenting case studies seen in your center(if I understood correctly) you need to tell us about how many hemophilia patients are seen in your center and tell us what percentage of those patients have pseudotumors. 2. Since I am not a surgeon please give some more details for why the case needed to be amputated? Was the invasion to great to be able to save something? Was your surgeons not properly trained to be able to do such and extensive surgery? I have not had a case in my country (Romania) which had to be amputated and would like some more details about that. 3. There are some minor grammar errors (such a a missing letter or and e instead of a) so please re-read your paper and correct them. There are also some words that are not properly used, and could be improved, but those do no present a grave error. 4. In the discussion subsection you repeat yourself to much about the availability of clotting factor, and how prophylaxis is reducing pseudotumors, but you present no background on what the situation is in your country or center. In order for us to understand how these cases got to this point we need some background of the situation. If you are not a hematologist please speack with a hematology specialist about this and add some more data about the prophylaxis background in your country.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are sufficient, but I think you could find something more recent than 2019 regarding this theme.	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	It is; it could use some minor improvements, as I stated above, but overall the language is appropriate and can be printed as such. Would give a more professional look if those minor grammar mistakes would be remedied.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It is a good article and I think it should be published, but only after the rectifications I mentioned. As it is, it gives us 4 interesting cases, but with no data about the other cases and background in his country, therefore we can not understand properly why it has gotten to that point.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Catalina Guran</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Emergency Municipal Hospital, Romania</b>