

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_97119
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATED COMPLETE TUBULAR DUPLICATION OF THE OESOPHAGUS IN A NEW BORN - A case report
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Describes a case of a relatively rare congenital pathology that will be of interest mainly to paediatric surgeons</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Enough</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article needs to be systematised.</p> <p>1. the abstract does not match the description of the case that is described.</p> <p>2. In the introduction, the authors present an overview of the problem. Although this overview is presented in the discussion section. The introduction should be concretised and shortened.</p> <p>3. The article only presents an examination of the patient. The results of the treatment and its outcome should be presented.</p> <p>4. There are very many references to the same cases in the discussion section. They should be merged.</p> <p>5. Overall, the article should be presented as follows: redo the abstract, a brief description of the problem in the introduction, a case description that should include both the examination and the results of treatment.</p> <p>6. The conclusions should relate specifically to the case.</p> <p>7. Repetition of classification and embryogenesis should be avoided.</p> <p>Conclusion. The article can be recommended for publication after substantial revisions.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aliaksandr Prokharau
Department, University & Country	Belarusian State Medical University, Belarus