

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_97510
Title of the Manuscript:	IgG4 disease revealed by a type 1 autoimmune pancreatitis : a case report
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>)

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)
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)	The manuscript is relevant in scientific community The title is suitable No methods/methodology was cited under Abstract and the entire study. Where was the study carried out? Hospital? Community?? Appropriate sentence cases (upper case and lower case) should be employed not only in the abstract but also in the entire work. Method employed for data collection/information obtained should be elucidated. Which setting/location was the case report carried out. Under discussion, Chari et al should be followed by the year in bracket. Discussion and Conclusion of the case report is too scanty. More information is needed. Fig 1 should be followed by "Abdominal" and not "abdominal" Which standard parameters were used to compare and analyze the result. References are sufficient. But More recent style such as APA or Harvard is recommended	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is appropriate for scholarly communications	
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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Doris N. Ajibo
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria