

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123618
Title of the Manuscript:	A Rare case of Pulmonary Tuberculosis presenting as subcutaneous swelling and nodular pleural thickening: 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>
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.	Tuberculosis, especially in children, can pose problems in diagnosis as it is usually benign forms of the disease (Ranke complex) and more rarely extensive and disseminated forms. The case is relevant because of the presence of rib bone damage on the opposite side of the location of pulmonary tuberculosis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is relatively appropriate and reflects the unusual presentation of TB in this case. However, a minor suggestion would be to include "in a pediatric patient" or "in a 12-year-old patient" to emphasize the rarity of the disease in the younger population. A suggestion could be: "A rare pediatric case of pulmonary tuberculosis discovered due to a subcutaneous swelling."	
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 is quite comprehensive and gives an overview of the clinical picture of the patient, the diagnostic process and the treatment. However, the description of the imaging is incomplete as the description of the lung lesions is missing. The diagnosis is based on the analysis of the pleural fluid. I would suggest confirming the full diagnosis. The bone lesion is not yet etiologically confirmed, if I understand correctly... is it considered a septic TB metastasis related to pulmonary tuberculosis?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the article provides for the sections introduction, case presentation, discussion and conclusion. In my opinion, each section could be significantly improved. I would suggest adding blood tests (even if they were normal), PPD skin tests or IGRA, correcting the errors in the clinical examination (high grade fever of 101 degrees centigrade?) and including sagittal CT slices and axial CT slices in the mediastinal window (for adenopathia), the stains used to identify the granuloma, indicating the presence of caseous necrosis, and sputum examination for BK microscopy and culture.	
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.	In my opinion, the presentation of the case needs to be significantly improved. The final diagnosis, the risk factors, the epidemiologic investigation and the form of tuberculosis (primary or secondary) are not clear. The pathophysiology of the case is also unclear. In addition, the case raises many questions from these points of view. What comparisons are there with other published studies? What message should be conveyed with this case?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The bibliography can be improved by more recent studies or reviews on distal bone metastasis of tuberculosi bacilli and nodular pleural thickening in tuberculosis, which would further strengthen the manuscript.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It should be improved	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	As I have outlined above, there are many considerations that need to be taken into account. Therefore, a comprehensive review is required.	

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:	Elena Dantes
Department, University & Country	Ovidius University of Constanta, Romania