

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_100139
Title of the Manuscript:	Retroperitoneal Non-functioning Paraganglioma: A Case Report with Review of 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.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript written satisfactorily.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Recent references may be included.</p> <p>1. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, Paragangliomas (PGs), computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) etc.). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words need to be abbreviated.</p> <p>2. The introduction part appears less informative about the paraganglioma, thus this section should be indicated as detailed to understand the manuscript in clear.</p> <p>3. The conclusion seems in general. All conclusions must be convincing statements on what was found to be novel, impact based on the strong support of the review data. Moreover, the authors may also be included the limitation of the present findings for a better understanding of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "a paraganglioma" may be as "paraganglioma"; "have both" as "have"; "investigation" as "the investigation"; "a lobulated and central areas" as "a lobulated and central area or lobulated and central areas"; "immunohistochemical" as "an immunohistochemical"; "is lack" as "is a lack"; "the extra-adrenal" as "extra-adrenal"; "The surgical" as "Surgical"; "the localized" as "localized"; "discovery" as "the discovery". The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words "para renal" may be as "pararenal"; "left sided" as "left-sided"; "well limited" as "well-limited"; "41 year old" as "41-year-old"; "4 month" as "4-month"; "colon we" as "colon, we"; "examination the" as "examination, the"; "show the" as "shows the"; "may be" as "maybe"; "non secreting" as "non-secreting"; "ten year" as "ten-year"; "follow- up" as "follow-up"; "followup" as "follow-up"; "however at" as "however, at"; "follow-up with" as "follow-ups with". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors have put effort to evaluate the "Retroperitoneal Non-functioning Paraganglioma: A Case Report with Review of Literature". The authors describe the research undertaken with this in an organized manner, emphasizing the results obtained by them. The article needs modification for better cohesion of information to achieve the goal and the shortcomings which need to be considered. Hence, the paper can be accepted after MINOR REVISIONS are carried out.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. Vijaya Anand
Department, University & Country	Bharathiar University, India