

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJCRS_117791
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical presentation and surgical approach with review of literature in cases of giant parathyroid adenoma
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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This case report are importance of early diagnosis and comprehensive treatment in managing of GPTA. PHPT itself is the one from most common endocrine human's disorder. The authors have done a good job of expanding knowledge in this field.</p> <p>2. In my opinion, the title of the manuscript is absolutely appropriate for the submitted text and I have no alternative</p> <p>3. Yes, the article abstract is absolutely comprehensive</p> <p>4. The article structure is right for the article in my mind</p> <p>5. As the scientific side, article is absolutely correct and understanding</p> <p>6. The references are old, as to my opinion. The youngest are from 2019.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The structure of the article is clear and well organized. The title, abstract, introduction, headings, subheadings, opening sentences, and conclusion of the article are well.</p> <p>Abstract gives an overview of the study's purpose, links with Materials and Methods.</p> <p>The authors identify gaps in the existing literature and tell us how the current study will fill that problem in the Introduction section of the article.</p> <p>In my opinion, the manuscript is suitable for publication. Overall, this is a good paper.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Olena Grechana
Department, University & Country	Zaporizhzhya State Medical and Pharmacy University, Ukraine