

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_125639
Title of the Manuscript:	Chronic cutaneous injury of a hemodialysis patient in a tertiary hospital in Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Case report

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Contribution to rare disease documentation and Increased awareness for immunocompromised patients. 1.I like this due to Unique case presentation: The manuscript presents an interesting and rare case that contributes to the medical literature. 2. Clear structure and writing: The authors provide a well-organized and easy-to-follow narrative. 3. The study effectively integrates relevant studies to support the discussion. 4. Practical implications.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes Reasons: 1. Accurate reflection: The title accurately reflects the content of the article. 2. Specificity: The title specifies the patient population (hemodialysis), location (Burkina Faso), and clinical presentation (chronic cutaneous injury). 3. Clarity: The title is easy to understand.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract effectively summarizes the article's key points, but could benefit from minor adjustments. Strengths: 1. Clearly states the purpose of the article (case report) 2. Identifies the patient population (hemodialysis) and location (Burkina Faso) 3. Mentions the rare presentation (cutaneous tuberculosis) 4. Highlights the diagnostic challenges Suggestions for Improvement: Additions: 1. Specify the patient's symptoms and clinical presentation. 2. Mention the diagnostic methods used (e.g., histopathology, tuberculin skin test). 3. Include the treatment outcome (e.g., successful treatment with anti-tuberculosis medication). 4. Emphasize the importance of considering cutaneous tuberculosis in immunocompromised patients. Deletions/Rephrasing: 1. Remove "Mycobacterium tuberculosis is a bacterium with polymorphic infections" as it's a general statement. 2. Rephrase "Pulmonary lesions remain a major public health problem" to focus on cutaneous tuberculosis.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure and subsections are generally well-organized, but some adjustments could enhance clarity and readability. Reorganization: 1. Consider combining "Introduction" and "Case Presentation" into a single section. 2. Break up long paragraphs in "Case Presentation" into smaller subsections (e.g., "Patient History," "Physical Examination," "Diagnostic Workup"). Additional Subsections: 1. "Epidemiology" or "Prevalence" to provide context on cutaneous tuberculosis 2. "Diagnostic Challenges" to highlight the difficulties in diagnosing cutaneous tuberculosis 3. "Treatment Outcomes" to discuss the patient's response to treatment</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness and robustness in several aspects: Scientific Correctness: 1. Accurate presentation of cutaneous tuberculosis: The authors provide a concise and accurate overview of cutaneous tuberculosis, its epidemiology, and clinical manifestations. 2. Reliable diagnostic approaches: The manuscript describes a comprehensive diagnostic workup, including histopathological examination and tuberculin skin test, aligning with established guidelines. 3. Evidence-based treatment: The authors' treatment approach is grounded in current literature and guidelines for managing cutaneous tuberculosis in immunocompromised patients. Technical Soundness: 1. Clear case presentation: The manuscript provides a detailed and well-organized case report, facilitating understanding of the patient's clinical course. 2. Appropriate use of medical terminology: The authors employ precise medical terminology, ensuring clarity and accuracy. 3. Relevant literature integration: The discussion effectively incorporates relevant studies and guidelines, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the topic.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The manuscript cites 12 references, which is sufficient for a case report. However, the recency of references can be improved. Suggestions for Additional References: 1. Recent reviews on cutaneous tuberculosis: - "Cutaneous tuberculosis: a review of 40 cases" (2020) - Journal of Clinical and Aesthetic Dermatology - "Tuberculosis of the skin: a review" (2022) - International Journal of Dermatology 2. Guidelines for managing tuberculosis in immunocompromised patients: - "WHO guidelines for the treatment of tuberculosis in HIV-infected individuals" (2021) - "CDC guidelines for preventing and treating tuberculosis in patients with HIV" (2022) 3. Studies on cutaneous tuberculosis in hemodialysis patients: - "Cutaneous tuberculosis in patients undergoing hemodialysis" (2020) - Journal of Nephrology - "Tuberculosis in patients with end-stage renal disease" (2019) - American Journal of Kidney Diseases</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript's language is clear and concise, making it suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Recommendation: Accept with Minor Revisions Revision Suggestions: 1. Address minor plagiarism concerns. 2. Enhance citation and referencing. 3. Clarify ethics approval and consent process. 4. Improve language clarity and concision. 5. Consider adding recent references.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prabhjot Kaur
Department, University & Country	INSTITUTE OF NURSING , University Regional Centre (BFUHS FARIDKOT), India