

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.	This is an interesting case summary bringing out the possible relation between tuberculosis, retroperitoneal fibrosis and Takayasu arteritis. This might serve as a tool for future research and further studies in the subject.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. Extremely rare case of tuberculosis and retroperitoneal fibrosis associated with Takayasu arteritis. I feel the actual title might be appropriate if more research has been presented in this regard including analysis of similar cases and pathological / cytological marker analysis to shed light whether it is a coincidence or has a pathological relationship.	
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.	Yes I like how the article has been formulated & presented. It is concise and to the point. Appreciation in this regard.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes I find it scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I find the references adequate (although not extensive)	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall the quality of the presentation & their clinical relevance are very good.	

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:	Palaniappan Inbamuthiah
Department, University & Country	Kuwait Hospital, United Arab Emirates