

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 (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.	TB can present in any radiological presentation, the respiratory physician should now about different clinical and radiological presentations of this common disease including its rare presentations	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	adequate	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Multiple repetitions of mistakes or confusions in clinical and radiological findings	
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.	Not technically sound because one should be clear while writing a paper, there should be no confusion for a reader regarding understanding about sides of clinical and radiological findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	ok	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	ok	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hafiz Muhammad Rizwan
Department, University & Country	Shiekh Zayed Medical College/ Hospial, Pakistan