

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_129629
Title of the Manuscript:	FROM TUBERCULOSIS TO RETROPERITONEAL FIBROSIS ASSOCIATED WITH TAKAYASU'S DISEASE: A COINCIDENTAL ASSOCIATION OR A PATHOGENETIC RELATIONSHIP?
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper highlights the rarity of the association between RPF and TD, emphasizing the need for further investigation into their potential common mechanisms. It explores the potential role of Mycobacterium tuberculosis in triggering autoimmune mechanisms that may lead to RPF and TD, supported by observations and literature references.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I would suggest: TUBERCULOSIS AND RETROPERITONEAL FIBROSIS ASSOCIATED WITH TAKAYASU'S DISEASE: A COINCIDENTAL ASSOCIATION OR A PATHOGENETIC RELATIONSHIP? - A CASE REPORT	
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.	You should give more data regarding the case, considering the number of word allowed	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The main manuscript has several flaws: 1. The author did not actually confirm the diagnosis of TB. Mycobacterium tuberculosis was not identified neither in sputum or in the biopsy. According to CDC.gov, Takayasu arteritis can potentially lead to a false-positive result in interferon-gamma release assays. 2. What is a nephritic kidney? 3. Resolution of the back pain, weight gain, normalization of blood pressure, and a negative CRP level are a confirmation of the improvement of the RF 4. In the Discussion, you should highlight if similar cases have been reported	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are very old. You should have at least 25% from the last 5 years	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Puia Dragos
Department, University & Country	Grigore T. Popa" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania