

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_98936
Title of the Manuscript:	Bilateral juvenile otosclerosis: case report
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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:

(<https://www.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1.The article is correctly written. It is an original one. The described pathology is uncommon in children. 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstract is receivable 4. As a case report, the structure of the text is correct 5. Yes, it is 6.References are up-to-date. <b>But 1s, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> references are uncompleted. Please precise the journal, the issue, year of publication and pages</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, quality is good. <b>But some corrections have to be made.</b> - <b>Fig 2 images have to be replaced by axial views passing through the oval window and showing hypodensity of the fistula ante fenestram</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	Lame Cheikh Ahmedou
Department, University & Country	Hôpital Principal de Dakar, Senegal