

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>                                  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JAMMR_97119</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>ISOLATED COMPLETE TUBULAR DUPLICATION OF THE OESOPHAGUS IN A NEW BORN - A case report</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Case Report</b>   |

### **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**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p> | <p>It will add to the list of reported cases of oesophageal tubular duplications<br/>The title is suitable, but the author needs to elaborate on the use of the word <u>isolated</u> in his/ her manuscript.<br/>The author need not write the embryology and classification of duplication cysts in the abstract. Instead, a brief summary of the case will do.<br/>Needs to be revised, reformatted and rewritten<br/>Corroborative literature can be put in the discussion part, instead of the introduction unless very necessary.<br/>References are fine<br/><b>Introduction –</b><br/>It does not elucidate why the author wants to present this case apart from it is rare. The author needs to make it structured<br/><b>Case report –</b><br/>As per the authors," A two-day-old male newborn was brought to the radiology department by a child specialist for contrast swallow examination. The Newborn was having respiratory distress, excessive salivation and intolerance to feeds. During laryngoscopy, two esophageal lumens were seen and two nasogastric tubes were placed by the child specialist under fluoroscopic guidance."<br/>1<br/>In a 2-day-old baby with respiratory distress, excessive salivation and intolerance to feeds why was a possibility of esophageal atresia not considered upfront instead of an esophageal duplication as the former is more common<br/>2<br/>Was the laryngoscopy done in the radiology department itself?<br/>3<br/>The author mentions" The duplicated segment was posterior and on the right side of the normal oesophagus, separated from it by a septum." In my view, to comment on/ or presume a septum on the basis of a contrast swallow film is not proper. It could well be a common wall.<br/>4<br/>The author mentions, "After the radiological examination, the child was shifted to the children's ward" There is no mention of any further management of the child. His operative and postoperative course.<br/><b>Discussion</b><br/>1<br/>The relevant literature is reviewed over a span of four pages. This is quite extensive for a case report. The author should make it concise or tabulate it to present meaningful information.<br/>2<br/>In the entire discussion, the author has not compared or analysed it against the existing literature.<br/>3<br/>Review of both the pediatric and adult literature is done simultaneously, which to my mind is not proper<br/><b>Conclusion</b><br/>It does not provide us with any conclusion or take home message</p> |  |
| <p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>  | <p>There are many Grammatical and spelling errors which need correction.</p>  |  |
| <p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>  |   |  |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Nitin Pant</b>                             |
| Department, University & Country | <b>King Georges Medical University, India</b> |