

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_99030
Title of the Manuscript:	Double cystic duct discovered intraoperatively in laparoscopic cholecystectomy, 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.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/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 REVISION</b> 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> <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes. A rare phenomenon is being brought to the attention of all. 2. I would rather suggest: <b>An incidental finding of double cystic ducts during Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy: A case report.</b> 3. Introduction It's Okay but i would suggest the following: a) <b>Anatomical Anomalies of the biliary duct</b> b) <b>Diagnosis can be made preoperatively by Abdominal USS and CT scan</b> Presentation a) Line 1: we should be <b>We</b> b) Line 3/4 presenting <b>with</b> right abdominal pain. <b>With</b> was omitted c) Line 5 : drained <b>into</b> and not in--- d) Line 6: ---admitted at an academic medical centre <b>for acute cholelithiasis and at operation a duplicated cystic duct was discovered</b> d) Line 8 : both cystic ducts were clipped <b>and divided</b> Discussion a) line 3 : ---rare biliary duct abnormality. <b>Several</b> ---- b) line 4 : --- <b>presented with a right upper colicky pain of six months duration</b> ---- c) line6 : ----without any <b>cholestatic</b> symptoms instead of cholestasis symptoms d) <b>At presentation</b> instead of "patient has been received in consultation" Main presentation of case a) line 2: ---treated <b>with</b> , and not by 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. <b>The references did not follow any specific referencing method. Needs to be revised</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Could be much better	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Comments: The take home from this study is minimal	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ofunre Eboreime</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Central Hospital, Nigeria</b>