

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>An ependymoma is a central nervous system (CNS) tumor. It can be diagnosed by an MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) scan, however a biopsy is necessary to confirm this. If not diagnosed or treated, it may lead to physical long-term effects include heart problems, lung problems, and secondary cancers. So the manuscript is important for scientific community</p> <p>The title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>The manuscript has no conclusion</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The last sentences in discussion section contain no reference. In addition it contain reference (18) which is not mentioned in references section. More than half of references are not recent. The manuscript containing many mistakes in grammar, spelling, and punctuation like in line 17, 23,35, 45, 49, 50, 52, 54, 58,.....,99. Line 70 was repeated. Key wards contain (lower extremity) which was not present anywhere in the manuscript. So please re-check all line of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Suitable	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hajir Karim Abdul-Hussein
Department, University & Country	University of Babylon, Iraq