

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_102791
Title of the Manuscript:	A Rare case report of HEPATIC VENOUS OUTFLOW TRACT OBSTRUCTION in patient with ULCERATIVE COLITIS
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.journalajrrga.com/index.php/AJRRGA/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Required REVIEW Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript) R/ THIS ARTICLE ABOUT REPORTING A RARE CASE OF A DISEASE IS NOT THE FIRST, BECAUSE SEVERAL ARTICLES HAVE ALREADY BEEN PUBLISHED IN PREVIOUS YEARS ON THIS SAME DISEASE. THEREFORE, I BELIEVE THAT IT IS NOT A NEW CASE. Is the title of the article adequate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) R/ THE TITLE ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF ARTICLES ALREADY PUBLISHED ON THIS DISEASE, SHOULD BE ADEQUATE, SOME MODIFICATION TO THE TITLE. SUGGESTION: ELIMINATE AS IT IS A RARE CASE. Is the article summary comprehensive? R/ THE SUMMARY MUST BE FIXED BECAUSE IT DOES NOT COMPLY WITH THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. IT WAS OUTSIDE THE JOURNAL'S STANDARD. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? R/ THE ARTICLE WAS NOT DIVIDED INTO SUBSECTIONS AS SUGGESTED BY THE JOURNAL. IT WAS WRITTEN WITHOUT FOLLOWING THE GUIDELINES OF THE JOURNAL, THEREFORE IT SHOULD BE ARRANGED AND ADJUSTED TO THE JOURNAL'S RULES. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? R/ IS NOT SCIENTIFICALLY CORRECT AND MUST BE ARRANGEMENT ACCORDING TO JOURNAL GUIDELINES Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them on the review form. R/ THE REFERENCES BY THE NUMBER COULD BE CORRECT (19 REFERENCES), BUT THEY ARE VERY OLD, OVER 8 YEARS UP TO 55 YEARS. THERE ARE MANY REFERENCES ON THE TOPIC, WHICH WERE NOT USED. SOME ARTICLES AND AN INTERNET SURVEY ARE ADDED, WITH MULTIPLE UPDATED OPTIONS. <p>(In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) R/ I CONSIDER THAT THIS ARTICLE SHOULD BE FULLY REVISED AND ADJUSTED TO THE JOURNAL'S RULES. BECAUSE IT PRESENTS MANY ERRORS FOR NOT FOLLOWING THE GUIDELINES OF THE JOURNAL. EX. 1- REFERENCES PLACED IN EXPONENTIALS, MUST BE BETWEEN PARENTHESIS [X]. 2- VERY WEAK SUMMARY AND WITHOUT FOLLOWING THE GUIDELINES OF THE JOURNAL., 3- THE INTRODUCTION WITH ONLY THREE LINES AND TWO REFERENCES, 4- THE TABLES AND FIGURES PLACED ALL GROUPED AT THE END OF THE ARTICLE, AND WITH ERRORS WHEN PUTTING THE INFORMATION IN THE FIGURE, ABOVE THE FIGURE - 5- SOME ABBREVIATIONS WITHOUT DEFINED THE MEANING., 6- VERY OLD REFERENCES MOST, ONE WITH 55 YEARS OF PUBLICATION AND OTHERS WITH 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, UP TO 20 YEARS OF PUBLICATION .</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	REVIEW minor comments 1. Is the language/English quality of the article adequate for scholarly communications? R/ I BELIEVE THAT AFTER IT IS FIXED, WE COULD ANALYZE THE QUALITY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. SO FAR, I BELIEVE IT IS SUITABLE FOR SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Havana University, Cuba