

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_100605
Title of the Manuscript:	An anesthesiologist's perspective of disseminated cutaneous rhinosporidiosis; 'Block resection' of the lesions!
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.journalajcrmh.com/index.php/AJCRMH/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

		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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community because apart from being a rare case, the management is rather difficult to do with general anaesthesia during surgery 2. The Title is better to replace with "An Anaesthesiologist's perspective on management of disseminated cutaneous rhinosporidiosis surgery based on case report" 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. The revision is in the manuscript 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. The revision is in the manuscript 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient but not recent because from the 13 references there are 11 references more than 10 years and some even 20 years This article is quite good , only the latest references are lacking	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language/English quality of the article need to be improved	
Optional/General comments	This article is useful	

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:	Fanny Margaretha Laihad
Department, University & Country	Hang Tuah University, Indonesia