

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_97263
Title of the Manuscript:	Laparoscopic Lateral Pancreaticojejunostomy for Chronic Calcific Pancreatitis with Impacted Endoscopic Pancreatic duct stent for more than a decade: Double Trouble
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.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes it is important an relevant, however it is not the first pancreatojejunostomy reported.</li> <li>- Yes. The title is suitable</li> <li>- The abstract can be improved and followed in the order stipulated by the journal, example: introduction, presentation of case, discussion, and conclusion.</li> <li>- The manuscript structure is correct; however, it can be improved on some points. For example, a better wording of the case, write if autoimmune pancreatitis or other aetiologies of chronic pancreatitis were sought. Also, it is important to write the surgical bleeding.</li> <li>- The references are sufficient, but citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]. And references must be written in the style stipulated by the journal. Example: list the first six authors and then followed by et al.</li> <li>- The paper is relevant and with great interest of the surgical community, although it is not the first case reported, the case is interesting.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The English language must be improved.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I appreciate the effort of the authors and the paper is interesting for publication in the journal after minimal changes.</li> </ul>	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jair Diaz Martinez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México</b>