

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRRGA_112657</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Place of echo endoscopy in unexplained acute pancreatitis</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Yes, the publication is relevant to the scientific community since it investigates the role of echo endoscopy in unexplained acute pancreatitis. The study's retrospective analysis of a large number of cases provides useful insights into the diagnostic efficacy of echo-endoscopy, which contributes to a better understanding and management of patients with this difficult condition in gastroenterology and pancreatology.</p> <p>It might be beneficial to include more details in the title, such as the study's design.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract for the article is comprehensive. It effectively summarizes the study's essential components, including the introduction, materials and methods, results, and conclusion.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript has adequate subsections and a well-organized structure. The structure adheres to established scientific writing concepts, making it easy to explore and understand.</p> <p>The manuscript looks to be scientifically correct based on the information presented. It takes a systematic approach, uses statistical analysis, and refers to relevant literature.</p> <p>The manuscript has a large number of references, indicating a thorough assessment of the existing literature. <b>However, the provided references do not follow a uniform citation style.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The writing is generally clear and well-organized, allowing readers to easily comprehend the study's aims, methods, and results. <b>Please review language quality for grammatical correctness.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>My Humble suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>It is advisable to divide longer paragraphs into smaller, more focused ones to enhance readability.</b></li> <li>• <b>Employ subheadings to categorize sections and enhance the navigability of the text.</b></li> <li>• <b>Use a consistent citation style for references.</b></li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nabeel Ayappali Kalluvalappil</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Science and Technology of Fujairah, UAE</b>