

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_104813
Title of the Manuscript:	A Huge Multicystic Splenic Lymphangioma In An Adult – Review of the literature
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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The paper discusses a rare case of splenic lymphangioma diagnosed in adulthood. Indeed, this kind of vascular tumours are most frequently discovered in childhood. Various sites have been presented in scientific literature.</p> <p>2. On my opinion, the term review of the literature is somehow overestimated. More literature research is mandatory to have a true review. I would suggest „short literature review”.</p> <p>3. The abstract is simply and concise and covers the main features of the paper. Still, the term neoplasm is to extensively used. I suggest changing it with "tumour" or simply "lesion" as in most cases it is associated with malignant pathology and this is not the case with lymphangiomas. The same concern is about the whole paper.</p> <p>4. The section "review of the literature" should not precede the case report. It should be in the same section with discussion.</p> <p>5. The paper is basically scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are clearly not enough for a review article. There are a lot of recent reports in Pubmed of lymphangiomas with different locations. I have recently published a paper of fetal axillary lymphangioma diagnosed in utero (Stefanescu BI, Munteanu IV, Radaschin DS, Constantin BG. Fetal axillary lymphangioma diagnosed on a 2D/4D ultrasound second trimester scan - a case report and short literature review. Med Ultrason. 2021 Nov 25;23(4):490-492. doi: 10.11152/mu-2531. Epub 2020 Jun 13. PMID: 32905576).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The spelling and grammar of the paper should definitely be improved. Some examples are highlighted in yellow.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bogdan Ioan Stefanescu
Department, University & Country	"Dunarea de Jos" University, Romania