

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_106721
Title of the Manuscript:	Robotic-Assisted Bilateral Cortical Sparing Adrenalectomy in A Case Of Bilateral Familial Pheochromocytoma – A Case Report And Review Of Literature
Type of the Article	Case report

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>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>1. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>2. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>3. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>4.</p> <p>5. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>YES, IT IS. Children operated on using robot-assisted laparoscopy are of interest to the scientific community (although in this specific case, the age of 14 referred by authors could correspond to the limit of childhood). In any case, it is of interest to be published in our journal.</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Yes it is, but it must be changed attending to some compulsory comments (showed below)</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Yes, they are. Fifteen references may be too many to describe a single case, but, as its title promises, the bibliography must be reviewed.</p> <p>Compulsory REVISION comments:</p> <p>1. It cannot be assured (in the summary) that the need of use of steroids for the rest of his life has been toppled, -- “<i>toppled the need for life-long steroid supplementation</i>”-, because the child's follow-up is ONE WEEK. Manuscript must be changed taking into account this issue.</p> <p>2. In conclusion, the authors cannot say anything about the management of “<i>pheochromocytomas</i>”, since in this case, it was reported by the authors that “<i>no evidence of malignancy</i>” had been observed in the histopathological study. Manuscript must be changed taking into account this issue.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Y	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Despite the changes (even if they have been specified as major ones in this revision), the article may be of interest to the scientific community. So, the reviewer encourages the authors to modify the manuscript for publication.</p> <p>2. It strikes me that “<i>with a diagnosis of pheochromocytoma</i>” preoperatively, the surgical approach is a “<i>sparing adrenalectomy</i>”. A paragraph could be added in discussion in this sense, as it is of interest to readers. And this issue is independent of the definitive histological result (as commented in the second compulsory comment)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pérez-Holanda, Sergio
Department, University & Country	Hospital Universitario Central de Asturias, Spain