

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_116785
Title of the Manuscript:	Increase In Incidence of Gall-bladder Carcinoma In Tea-estate Workers in a Tertiary Care Centre
Type of the Article	

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>)

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
--	---------------------------	---

Review Form 1.7

<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Dear editor</p> <p>Thank you for asking me to review this article.</p> <p>### Pros:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">**Relevance**: The study addresses an important issue of increasing gallbladder carcinoma (GBC) incidence in tea estate workers, which can have significant public health implications.**Data Collection**: The study includes a large sample size over an 8-year period, enhancing the reliability of the findings.**Observational Study**: Being a retrospective observational study, it can provide valuable insights into potential risk factors and trends.**Awareness**: The study highlights the need for awareness and further research regarding the use of pesticides and their association with GBC. <p>### Cons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">**Limitations of Observational Studies**: While observational studies are valuable, they cannot establish causation, so the link between pesticide exposure and GBC needs to be further investigated through controlled studies.**Data Collection Methods**: There could be limitations in the accuracy and completeness of data collected from various sources, which might affect the study's conclusions.**Bias**: There might be biases in patient selection, especially if the study did not account for potential confounding variables such as age, smoking habits, or other occupational exposures.**Generalizability**: The study's findings may be specific to the population and region studied, limiting their generalizability to other populations or areas. <p>#### The following changes should be made to improve the clarity and readability of the article:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">"peticide" should be corrected to "pesticide" throughout the article."It causes damage to the DNA. Al-though" should be revised to "It causes damage to the DNA, although"."and in raising trends;" should be revised to "and are on the rise;"."suspicion towards use of pesticides in the Tea-gardens." could be clarified as "suspicion regarding the use of pesticides in tea gardens.""more studies needs to be done" should be "more studies need to be done"."aspect of tea garden workers and pesticide usage ;to create more awareness." could be rephrased as "aspect of pesticide usage among tea garden workers, to create more awareness." <p>Here are some additional grammatical errors and areas for improvement in the article:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">"North, East, Northeast and Central India are among the high incidence areas for gallbladder in contrast to South and West India." - This sentence is a bit confusing and could be rephrased for	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>clarity, such as: "North, East, Northeast, and Central India are regions with a high incidence of gallbladder carcinoma, in contrast to South and West India."</p> <p>8. "Over last 08 years(July -14 to July-22), Total 71,541 cases admitted under General Surgery from O.P.D & Emergency department has been included in the study." - The phrase "Total 71,541 cases admitted under General Surgery" should be followed by "have been included in the study" to match the plural subject.</p> <p>9. "Data collected from AMCH Cancer Registry ,M.R.D Office, Admission records of surgery department and O.T records." - It would be clearer to list each data source separately: "Data were collected from the AMCH Cancer Registry, M.R.D Office, admission records of the surgery department, and O.T records."</p> <p>10. "It is well established fact that occupation hazards do constitute to the carcinogenesis (dye workers and urinary bladder CA) but more studies needs to be done in the aspect of tea garden workers and pesticide usage ;to create more awareness." - This sentence could be revised for clarity and grammatical correctness: "It is a well-established fact that occupational hazards contribute to carcinogenesis (e.g., in dye workers and urinary bladder cancer), but more studies are needed to examine the impact on tea garden workers and pesticide usage, in order to raise awareness."</p> <p>Here are a few more corrections and suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>11. "IN MALE: O3 in 242- G.B Pathology" - This should be "IN MALE: 03 cases in 242 patients with G.B Pathology" for clarity.</p> <p>12. "IN FEMALE: 256 in 2083 - G.B Pathology patients (b/w 2014-18)" - This could be revised as "IN FEMALE: 256 cases in 2083 patients with G.B Pathology (2014-18)".</p> <p>13. "IN MALE TEA-GARDEN POPULATION : It was 23.07 % (b/w 2014-18)" - This could be clarified as "IN MALE TEA-GARDEN POPULATION: The rate was 23.07% (2014-18)".</p> <p>14. "IN FEMALE TEA-GARDEN POPULATION : It was 60.1 % (b/w 2014-18)" - This could be clarified as "IN FEMALE TEA-GARDEN POPULATION: The rate was 60.1% (2014-18)".</p> <p>15. "Dimethoate,Tetradifon,Monocrotophos are few of the toxic compound used as peticide in the tea garden." - "Compound" should be pluralized to "compounds" and "peticide" should be corrected to "pesticide".</p> <p>16. "It is well established fact that occupation hazards do constitute to the carcinogenesis (dye workers and urinary bladder CA) but more studies needs to be done in the aspect of tea garden workers and pesticide usage ;to create more awareness." - This could be revised as "It is a well-established fact that occupational hazards contribute to carcinogenesis (e.g., in dye workers and</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>urinary bladder cancer), but more studies are needed to examine the impact on tea garden workers and pesticide usage to create more awareness."</p> <p>17. "Cases of Ca Gb in north-east region is significantly high , and in raising trends; suspicion towards use of pesticides in the Tea-gardens." - This could be clarified and rephrased: "Cases of gallbladder carcinoma in the northeast region are significantly high and are on the rise, raising suspicions regarding the use of pesticides in tea gardens."</p> <p>### Overall Assessment:</p> <p>Despite the errors the article had with some weaknesses that mentioned above, need to be addressed first.</p> <p>After that, the study provides valuable insights into the increasing incidence of GBC in tea estate workers and raises important questions about the role of pesticide exposure. However, further research is needed to establish a causal relationship and to address potential biases and limitations in data collection and analysis</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I mentioned above all the required answers for questions, please refer back to them.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Waheeb Al-Kubati</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>21st September University, Yemen</p>