

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_121725
Title of the Manuscript:	What is the Impact of Endoscopic Ultrasound in the Management of Pancreatic Cystic Tumors?
Type of the Article	Retrospective study

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is retrospective study about ultrasound and pancreatic cystic tumors, written from a small volume but high performant center. It is a good experience.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the impact is not explained	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	no	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	To be scientifically robust it should include a more detailed discussion not only compare with 2/3 articles with similar results. I suggest to support the intent of the study with more literature reviews or metanalysis	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	Discussion should be improved	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manuela Cesaretti
Department, University & Country	Beaujon Hospital, France