

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_98921
Title of the Manuscript:	SONOGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT OF PANCREATIC ECHOGENICITY IN NORMAL ADULTS IN SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalajrrga.com/index.php/AJRRGA/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>There is a paucity of data about ultrasonographic findings in african populations thus such an article is interesting.</p> <p>I think that repeating south is not appropriate possibly It should be stressed that it comes from 4 institutions eg multicenter study in south Nigeria I doubt if 'normal' patients are actually normal as age might be followed by change of the metabolic profil and usually followed by various commorbidities Thus I think without any pancreatic pathology is better. The abstract is comprehensive. In the methods section statistics should be omitted and instead the authors should report parameters evaluated Moreover in the reuslts they should stress interobserver agreement and report the significance of all important parameters The authors should include apart from tables a brief text with details about the main findings described in tables. The population is not gender balanced but since the gender does not affect final results it is acceptable, nevertheless it should be stressed in the discussion. In the introduction it should be mention that water is used to better visualize pancreas and that fasting is mandatory to avoid excess bowel gas I do not know if the metabolic profil is available but it would be interesting to compare pancreatic echogenicity with blood sugar, triglicerides or other metabolic parameters.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientific correct.</p> <p>Worthen NJ, et al. Normal pancreatic echogenicity: relation to age and body fat. AJR 1982;139:1095-1101</p> <p>H. Oh, et al. Hyperechoic pancreas on ultrasonography: an analysis of its severity and clinical implications Ultrasonography 2022;41:335-343</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A thorough spelling revision is mandatory to avoid sentences like 'age was positively correlated with age' asa well as spelling errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Panagiotis Tsibouris
Department, University & Country	NIMTS General Hospital, Greece