

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_101988
Title of the Manuscript:	Extraspinal Sacrococcygeal Ependymoma
Type of the Article	CASE REPORT

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.journalajorr.com/index.php/AJORR/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, yes, it is as a case report it is important.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, they are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, I think it is true, but the correctness of the subject of this sample report depends on the examination of other samples and the proof of the main hypothesis or question in this research. Therefore, it has descriptive importance only for the scientific community and cannot bring a specific conclusion.</p> <p>Yes, they are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>es, I think language quality of the article is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the first step, I will present a case report from the author(s) of this report, I suggest to add more literature and background by citing newer and more references to strengthen the issue and confirm the issue raised in this manuscript.</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:	Farzad Mirshamsi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran