

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Surgery</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRS_120821</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Giant Desmoid Tumor Of The Sigmoid Colon Mesentery</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article presents a clinical case with a rare disease. Few cases of desmoid mesenteric tumors are mentioned in the literature. Bringing a new case to the attention of the scientific community is justified and welcome.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>The summary contains the essential information about the discussed pathology. 2 of the keywords are not related to the topic: "Familial adenomatous polyposis" and "Gardner's syndrome". The article mentions that mesenteric tumors appear more often in patients with Gardner's syndrome or Familial adenomatous polyposis, but the article presents a case of sporadic desmoid tumor, which did not occur in a patient with Gardner's or Familial adenomatous polyposis. I suggest giving up these 2 keywords and choosing another word.</p> <p>2 of the keywords are not related to the topic: "Familial adenomatous polyposis" and "Gardner's syndrome". I suggest giving up these 2 keywords and choosing another keyword.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>The article presents a case of a rare abdominal tumor. The presentation of the case is clear and well documented. The information about the case is concise, accurate and well-illustrated with images. The diagnostic reasoning is logical, well argued. The treatment is the right one. The images are of high quality and suggestive.</p> <p>The discussion chapter reviews the up-to-date information from the specialized literature.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	<p>The bibliography is satisfactory. The way articles are cited can be improved.</p> <p>At the end of the document, I have inserted a table in which I specify how I consider the correct way of citation.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The English quality is suitable.</p> <p>On page 3 there is a sentence ("The median age of presentation ranges from 27 to 70 years, with a male preponderance") which contains an error. The median is the value that divides a finite series into 2 halves. The median has a numerical value. In fact, the median age mentioned in the literature for desmoid tumors is 32.5 years (de Camargo VP, Keohan ML, D'Adamo DR, Antonescu CR, Brennan MF, Singer S, Ahn LS, Maki RG. Clinical outcomes of systemic therapy for patients with deep fibromatosis (desmoid tumor). 2010 May 1; 10: 1002/cncr. PMID: 2925106.) Correct is "The age of presentation ranges from 27 to 70 years". If the authors want to specify the median, then they must enter a concrete value.</p> <p>Correct is "The age of presentation ranges from 27 to 70 years". If the authors want to specify the median, then they must enter a concrete value.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The article can be published with some minor revisions.	

### **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:	Fabian Ovidiu-Vasile
Department, University & Country	Iuliu Hațieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania