

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_98817
Title of the Manuscript:	ULTRASOUND ASSESSMENT OF PANCREATIC DIMENSIONS 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://journalirjgh.com/index.php/IRJGH/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is very concise and focused on a very small group of people. It can prove useful only for the population of South-South Nigeria</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, the abstract clearly lacks the gap in the existing research. The gap needs to be highlighted and the approach used in this article to fulfil the gap should be clearly written.</p> <p>The manuscript lacks the data representation in the forms of graphs, which should be added to the manuscript before publication.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The work here is solely compared multiple times with 2-3 other works (Syed <i>et al</i>, Wang <i>et al</i> and Aliyu <i>et al</i>. There are numerous articles published in this area that can be used to provide much clearer discussion and comparison studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct the details of reference 7 in the reference section.</li> <li>• The manuscript gives one reason for all the disagreement between this research and others, which is stated as "These variations may also be due to the different sample sizes, age groups, methodology of the various studies". A much more scientific explanation needs to be provided.</li> <li>• There is a lack of complimentary/supportive study for the research.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ashish Pandey
Department, University & Country	New York University, USA