

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJCRS_95036</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Eagle Syndrome: Case Report with Literature Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</b>

### 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 <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. 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. This manuscript describes the symptoms associated with Eagle syndrome and how to manage them, which may be useful in the clinical treatment of the disease. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. (1) The abstract section lacks a description of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of surgical measures for the disease. (2) The abstract section lacks a description of the outcome of the patient's case. 4. The parts and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The reference material is correct and relatively new, But here are two additional comments:  (1) It is not stated in the discussion section which of the two typical types the patient belongs to, and it should be necessary to explain here. (2) In the discussion section, it was mentioned that the use of 3D CT is currently the best way to do it, why? Should this be compared to other solutions to illustrate. (3) In the conclusion section, there is a lack of a summary of the treatment techniques and results of the cases mentioned in this article, and there should be a more detailed explanation here.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The quality of English needs to be improved.	
<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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Xingsi Xue</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Computer Science and Mathematics, Fujian University of Technology, China</b>