

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_76365
Title of the Manuscript:	Tubercular Dactylitis-A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract paragraph</b> Line 12, Keywords, double commas after Dactylitis, misspell of Tuberculous</p> <p><b>Introduction paragraph</b> Line 20, Misspell of mimics</p> <p><b>Case report paragraph</b> Line 26, “in last 3 weeks” maybe “in the previous 3 weeks” is more appropriate Line 27, “keeping in view..” could be replaced by “taking into account the...” Line 28,”but” could be replaced by “however” “like loss..” could be replaced by “i.e. loss..” Line 31, “Hematocrit” should be replaced by “Haematocrit”, “was” should be replaced by “were” since it refers to TLC and DLC Line 33, “3rd meracarpal” the third should be superscript and meracarpal should be corrected to “metacarpal” (same correction in line 85 in fig.2 legend) Line 35, “NCCT” not defined in the text and no information to allow reproducibility of the technique has been provided by the authors Line 38, “USG” same comment as for NCCT</p> <p><b>Discussion paragraph</b> Line 56, skeletal misspelt Line 57, tuberculous misspelt Line 56 and 57, “too” not necessary Line 62 Anaemia misspelt Line 65-67, this sentence could be rephrased, a possibility could be “therefore, tubercular dactylitis, although representing a rare manifestation of skeletal tuberculosis, should be taken into consideration in case of children with swelling hands” Line 67, “amicably” not necessary</p> <p><b>Conclusion paragraph</b> Line 69, tuberculous misspelt Line 71, “As no single feature is diagnostic of tubercular aetiology” could be improved as “as no single feature is resolute for the tubercular aetiology, ..” Line 72, “history taking” could be replaced by patients anamnesis</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction paragraph</b> Line 19 and 20, double spaces</p> <p><b>Case report paragraph</b> Double spaces (line 24,25,26,27,28,29,30,33,35,38,40)</p> <p><b>Discussion paragraph</b> Double spaces (line 48,49,50,51,52,53,55,57,60,61,63,67,68) Missing spaces (line 56,58)</p> <p><b>Conclusion paragraph</b> Double spaces (line 69,70,71)</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The case report “Tubercular Dactylitis-A Case Report” present a collective approach for the diagnosis of tubercular dactylitis reporting that this skeletal pathology should be taken into consideration especially in case of children that present swelling hands, since no feature is resolute for the tubercular aetiology.	
---------------------------	---	--

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:	Soldati Enrico
Department, University & Country	Aix Marseille University, France