

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_110464
Title of the Manuscript:	Beyond the Usual Suspects: Emerging Insights into Takayasu’s Arteritis and its Role in Secondary Hypertension
Type of the Article	Case report

## Review Form 1.7

## PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's comment</b> ( <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> )
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community since Takayasu arteritis is a rare disease and affects 2.6 people out of 1 million. This case report emphasizes on importance of early diagnosis of Takayasu arteritis in a suspected patient. It also sheds light on the association of Takayasu arteritis with hypertension.</p> <p>2. Yes, title is suitable</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is well-written and includes all important details</p> <p>4. Yes, structure is appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct but I have some concerns that I will explain below in the “general comments” section.</p> <p>6. Yes, for a case report 24 references are sufficient but I would like them to incorporate this reference there since it appears that this article was used at multiple places for writing this manuscript. Authors may correct me if I am wrong.</p> <p>Sadurska E, Jawniak R, Majewski M, Czekajska-Chehab E. Takayasu arteritis as a cause of arterial hypertension. Case report and literature review. Eur J Pediatr. 2012 May;171(5):863-9. doi: 10.1007/s00431-012-1674-z. PMID: 22290282; PMCID: PMC3327834.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for taking your valuable time in reviewing this work of ours and commenting on it.</p> <p>Thanks for suggesting this and I have added this in the references section of the revised manuscript.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>1. Yes, in most places language quality is fine but there are some grammatical and sentence structure mistakes. I have made 43 comments in the manuscript Word file. Please read those comments and rectify them accordingly.</p>	<p>I have read all the comments made in the manuscript and modified/changed/added the necessary details as suggested by the reviewer in the revised manuscript,</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>1. I believe most of the Introduction, Discussion, and Case Presentation sections of this manuscript are taken from the article that I am mentioning here. Even the sequence of sentences appears to be similar in many places. Please contact the corresponding author of this manuscript to confirm that. Please let the authors know that you cannot take everything from one single article and also that you have to give acknowledgment to the article by mentioning it in references.</p> <p><b>Sadurska E, Jawniak R, Majewski M, Czekajska-Chehab E. Takayasu arteritis as a cause of arterial hypertension. Case report and literature review. Eur J Pediatr. 2012 May;171(5):863-9. doi: 10.1007/s00431-012-1674-z. PMID: 22290282; PMCID: PMC3327834.</b></p> <p>2. I think there are referencing mistakes in this manuscript. Because the references of this manuscript clash with the above “Sadurska E” article, while the data mentioned in both is</p>	<p>I have referred the source article and mentioned that in the reference section too, after your suggestion.</p> <p>The references are cross checked once again after receiving the comments and modified accordingly</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p>identical. Please ask the authors to cross-check all references again.</p> <p>3. Please ask authors to include pictures of C.T. angiogram scan, USG scan, and SCTA scan within the article. This will not only prove the originality of this case but will also help the reader in understanding the case in detail.</p> <p>4. I have mentioned 43 comments in the Word file of the manuscript. Authors are requested to address all those minor and major issues.</p>	<p>We haven't been permitted to use the images of the scan reports. That's the reason we haven't used them in the manuscript</p> <p>I have made the necessary changes in the revised manuscript after going through the comments being made.</p>
--	---	--

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	