

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57292

Title: Thyroid tuberculosis mimicking malignancy: A diagnostic trap in the presence of cervical lymphadenopathy – A case report.

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision.....

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR-198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This manuscript presents a case report of thyroid tuberculosis mimicking malignancy, which is a rare and clinically relevant condition. The case is interesting and highlights an important diagnostic challenge. However, the manuscript requires moderate revision before it can be considered for publication. The main issues relate to language quality, clarity, and structure rather than scientific merit.

Strengths

- The case highlights a rare and clinically important diagnostic pitfall.
- Follow-up data is provided, which strengthens the report.
- The topic is relevant for clinicians in tuberculosis-endemic regions.

Major Comments

1. Language and Grammar

The manuscript contains frequent grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistent tense usage. This significantly affects readability. Professional English editing is strongly recommended.

2. Clarity of Case Presentation

The case description is understandable but lacks smooth flow. Some sentences are unclear or poorly structured. Clinical details should be presented more logically (history → examination → investigations → management).

REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. Diagnostic Workup

The role of FNAC is mentioned but not adequately discussed. It would be useful to explain why FNAC was inconclusive and whether additional tests (e.g., PCR, Ziehl–Neelsen staining) were considered before surgery.

4. Justification for Surgery

The manuscript states that surgery was performed due to suspicion of malignancy, but this decision is not sufficiently justified. More explanation is needed on why conservative or additional diagnostic approaches were not pursued.

5. Discussion Section

The discussion is informative but somewhat repetitive and lacks critical analysis. It should better highlight:

- What makes this case unique
- How it differs from previously reported cases
- Key clinical lessons for practitioners

Minor Comments

1. There are multiple spacing and formatting issues throughout the manuscript.
2. Some abbreviations (e.g., FNAC) should be defined at first use.
3. Typographical errors are present (e.g., missing spaces, inconsistent punctuation).
4. References formatting is inconsistent and should follow journal guidelines.
5. The abstract contains minor grammatical issues and should be refined for clarity.
6. Keywords should be standardized (consider MeSH terms if required).