

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57242

Title: Update Thyroid Emergencies

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- Accept after minor revision.....✓.....**
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*).....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity	✓			
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study

- Covers an important and life threatening clinical topic
- Provides clear overview of different thyroid emergencies
- Well structured with sections like diagnosis clinical features and management
- Table on page 1 clearly compares thyrotoxic crisis and myxedema coma
- Includes both clinical and laboratory aspects of diagnosis
- Management section is practical and useful for clinicians
- Information is concise and easy to follow

Weakness of the study

- Review article without any original data or analysis
- No clear methodology for literature selection
- Ethical clearance statement not mentioned
- Language and grammar issues in some sections
- Limited depth in discussion of recent advances
- References are relatively few and not very recent
- Some sections are very brief and lack detailed explanation

Reviewers Comments

The manuscript provides a concise overview of thyroid emergencies, which is an important and clinically relevant topic. The structure of the paper is clear, with sections on diagnosis, clinical features, and management that are easy to follow. The comparison table on page 1 is particularly helpful in differentiating thyrotoxic crisis and myxedema coma. The management section also gives practical guidance for clinicians. However, the manuscript is mainly descriptive and does not include any original data or systematic review methodology. Ethical clearance is not applicable for this type of article, but a statement should be included for clarity. The writing quality is generally acceptable, but there are minor grammar issues and some sentences could be improved for clarity. The discussion is somewhat limited and does not include recent updates or deeper critical analysis. Overall, the paper is informative but would benefit from improvement in depth, references, and language quality before publication.