

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_97999
Title of the Manuscript:	PROLACTIN-SECRETING PITUITARY MACROADENOMA PRESENTING WITH HORMONAL DEFICIENCIES CHARACTERISED BY HYPOPITUITARISM AND NEUROGENIC DIABETES INSIPIDUS: a case report and review.
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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>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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The information given into the manuscript is good and informative scientifically. However there are some suggestions/corrections to do in order to make the manuscript more attractive and informative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Abstract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What has this case taught you? What is the take-home message for the reader? The author should well highlight these questions into the abstract. ❖ Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Write the introduction with four paragraphs in maximum ➤ Well state the subject matter and the purpose of the case report ➤ Well highlight how rare this condition is, and why your case report is important? ❖ Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Well highlight the comparison and contrast the nuances of the case report with the literature review. Well explain the similarities and differences between the case report and the literature. ➤ If possible, you could add the limitations of the case report and describe their relevance ➤ Well summarize the salient features of the case report and also well justify the uniqueness of the case. You should sum up the current literature related to your case. Describe what has already been reported about your topic, and what the main hypotheses and theories are that explain the clinical findings. Remember that reviewers will be looking for evidence that your case is rare. ➤ At the end, you should describe in detail the message that you are conveying through your report. This may be in line with current thinking, or even contrary to popular belief. Focus on the lessons that should be learnt from your experience, and how this affects future clinical practice. ❖ Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Write your conclusion in only one paragraph. ➤ I suggest you to also provide evidence based recommendations and describe how the information learned applies to one's own practice. ➤ List opportunities for research. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ndoe Guiaro Marcellin
Department, University & Country	Institute of Medical Research and Medicinal Plants Studies, Cameroon