

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71111
Title of the Manuscript:	A Case Report on Nursing Care of Takayasu Arteritis
Type of the Article	

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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Takayasu syndrome is a rare autoimmune disease. The authors make an effort not only to present the case of 37 years old patient with Takayasu syndrome, but also to prepare a mini-compendium on the diagnosis, treatment and care of a patient with this disease. In the manuscript, the authors try to combine two topics - one is the case of a 37-year-old patient with Takayasu syndrome, the other is the standards of nursing care. The case report is conducted non-chronologically, the diagnosis is made almost at the very beginning, a significant part of the interview, including the socio-economic interview, is in the middle of the text and the results of laboratory and imaging tests are presented in any order. The whole thing needs to be systematized. The presentation of the results of imaging tests (CT, Doppler, etc.) could be supplemented with illustrations. The names of the drugs used should be supplemented with the names of the active substances. In the next part of the manuscript, the authors outline the scope and role of nursing care for a patient with Takayasu syndrome. Unfortunately, the fragment is a presentation of recommendations, and it does not document any post-nursing activities, this does not refer in any way to the presented patient. In describing the case, the authors do not mention the role of nursing care and its effects in this particular case.</p> <p>Summarizing: The title refers to nursing care The executive summary refers to the case report Case report (omits nursing care) The Nursing Care Guidelines chapter appears Nursing care is not discussed in the discussion chapter Chapter Conclusions do not mention anything about nursing care.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The language is weak in some places, e.g .: "A rarity of form of vasculitis, also known as TAK, induces inflammation in the walls of the major arteries in the body: the aorta and its main branches. The disease results from a body attack and inflammation of the walls of the arteries caused by the body's own immune system". Will be better: A rarity of form of vasculitis, also known as Takayasu syndrome (TAK), usually applies to large arteries (the aorta and its main branches). TAK belongs to the family of autoimmune diseases.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I propose to prepare 2 manuscripts; The first with a short case report: Interview, physical examination, results of laboratory and additional tests, diagnosis, treatment. In the discussion, a brief presentation of the epidemiology and clinical differences of the takayasu syndrome depending on the local conditions of a given part of the world, modern treatment methods and prognosis.</p> <p>The second is a short compendium covering epidemiology (in the region where the authors of the manuscript come from), symptoms and signs, recommended laboratory and imaging tests, pharmacological and surgical treatment, and the special role and scope of nursing care, as well as the role of rehabilitation.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wojciech Jacheć
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Silesia, Poland