

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_121808
Title of the Manuscript:	Cerebral Gliomatosis: delayed diagnosis and management difficulties Through a case report
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>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it sheds light on the rare and challenging condition of Cerebral Gliomatosis (CG), particularly highlighting the complexities of diagnosis and the current limitations in treatment. The manuscript also underscores the urgent need for further research to develop more effective diagnostic tools and therapeutic strategies for CG.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Cerebral Gliomatosis: Delayed Diagnosis and Management Difficulties Through a Case Report" is appropriate, but it could be slightly refined for clarity and impact.</p> <p>"Cerebral Gliomatosis: Challenges in Delayed Diagnosis and Management—A Case Report"</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 provided in your initial case report could be refined to fit the required structure: Aims, Presentation of Case, Discussion, and Conclusion. Currently, it lacks clear sectioning into these categories. Each section should be concise, focusing on key details that convey the importance and relevance of the case. Add relevant keywords to the abstract to highlight the focus of the report, e.g., "Cerebral Gliomatosis," "Diagnosis," "Management," "Pediatric Neuro-oncology."</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, but they could benefit from some refinements to fully meet academic standards and enhance readability. The introduction provides a good overview of Cerebral Gliomatosis (CG) and its significance. But consider briefly outlining the specific aim or rationale for presenting this case in the introduction to set the context for the reader. The discussion provides an overview of CG and compares the case with existing literature. Strengthen this section by discussing the implications of this case for clinical practice, exploring alternative diagnoses, and providing a deeper analysis of the diagnostic challenges. Consider adding subheadings like "Diagnostic Challenges," "Comparison with Literature," and "Clinical Implications" to organize the content better.</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>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound as it provides a thorough and well-documented case of Cerebral Gliomatosis (CG), a rare and challenging condition. The clinical findings, including imaging and spectrometry results, are presented in detail, supporting the diagnosis and adding depth to the discussion. The manuscript also references current literature and aligns the case with known characteristics of CG, which enhances its scientific credibility. Additionally, the use of advanced diagnostic tools, such as MRI and spectroscopy, demonstrates the application of appropriate and modern techniques in the clinical evaluation of the patient, further underscoring the manuscript's technical accuracy.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there may be room for improvement to enhance clarity and readability. The manuscript effectively communicates complex medical information, but refining the language to ensure it is concise and precise would strengthen its scholarly tone.	
Optional/General comments	1. Discuss the implications of the lack of effective treatment options and how this case underlines the need for new therapeutic approaches or research into alternative management strategies. 2. Provide a brief review of existing literature on CG, comparing this case with other reported cases. This helps to contextualize the findings and adds to the report's originality. 3. Go deeper into the challenges faced during the diagnosis and management of this case. Discuss alternative diagnoses that were considered and how they were ruled out. 4. Based on the difficulties encountered, suggest areas for future research, such as exploring new diagnostic biomarkers or potential therapeutic targets for CG.	

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:	Ayesha Agrawal
Department, University & Country	Mody University, India

Review Form 3