

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Oncology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AORJ_97318
Title of the Manuscript:	Carpal tunnel syndrome caused by Palmaris Profundus sharing common sheath with median nerve
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.journalaorj.com/index.php/AORJ/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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1- This manuscript reports a rare case with anatomic variation of a common hand problem. Knowing about these cases is so important for any hand physician including orthopaedists and physiatrist for better understanding and managing these patients. So this manuscript is important for scientific community. 2- Yes the title is clear and suitable. 3- Yes the abstract is Ok. 4- Yes 5- It is scientifically correct but not sufficient, much important data and information about the case has not been mentioned in the manuscript. 6- Such as: the exact symptomatic managements that the patient had received before operation, the electrophysiologic study data of the patient before and after the operation, whether the muscle strength has improved after surgery or not. 7- Conclusion should be revised too; since in the manuscript has been noted that the operation included dissection of the tendon sheet; and it doesn't make sense that just releasing the flexor retinaculum (standard surgery of most of the CTS cases) is enough procedure in a case who has a tendon adherent to the median nerve in a common sheet like this case. 8- Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1- It is understandable but has several grammatical mistakes. So I recommend a grammatical edition on the manuscript.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) Authors have got the patient written informed consent. So I believe there is no ethical problem with the manuscript.	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sharareh Roshanzamir
Department, University & Country	Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran