

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_99617
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ROLE OF MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING IN THE DIAGNOSIS OF SPINAL DUMBELL NEUROFIBROMATOSIS. A CASE REPORT FROM A SPECIALIST HOSPITAL IN PORT HARCOURT.
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://journalijmPCR.com/index.php/IJMPCR/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>	1. Yes, the manuscript may be important 2. Yes, the title is reasonable 3. Yes, the abstract appears to be comprehensive 4. Yes, the sectioning and flow are reasonable 5. Yes, although more context would be helpful, and although I'm not an expert on neurofibromatosis, my opinion is that the science is reasonable 6. Seventeen references is a little on the thin side, but may be reasonable for a very specialized phenotype, presenting in a rare disease  To optimize the usefulness of a case report, more analytical criteria should be described and rationalized. For example, it would be helpful to explicitly pinpoint the 'dumbell' feature within the images, indicate what criteria were used to distinguish a diagnostic dumbell shape versus an ordinary range of physiologically normal conformations or non-dumbell pathological presentations, and maybe describe how the pathologically distinguishable structure differentially develops. Have other patients been similarly examined, in order to provide some stage-level characterization of the pathological progression?	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	In general, the manuscript is well written. At some point in file format conversion, however, spaces disappeared between some words, yielding splices like "Infact" and "likechange". Careful proofreading will thus be required.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	<b>Gerald Lushington</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kansas State University, USA</b>