

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Pediatric Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPR_114847</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Treatment and outcome of choledochal cyst, our experience in SheikhRussel National Gastroliver Institute and Hospital, Mohakhali Dhaka</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes, I agree that the concept of what the author wanted to discuss can be relevant to a surgical journal</b></li> <li>2. <b>Title is suitable.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Very grammatically incorrect with poor use of journal appropriate language. Abbreviations used, which have not yet been defined. Key words need to be improved. Also needs to be in line with the abstracts specified word count.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Subsections and structure are appropriate. (However, this needs to be in line with the journals specifications, which I am not familiar with)</b></li> <li>5. <b>I am not sure what is meant by academically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>References appariparte.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Additional major concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Concern regarding the methodology (which is the major criteria for journal acceptance). If the methodology is not adequate, the study is not passable.</b></li> <li>- <b>Inclusion and exclusion criteria poorly delineated.</b></li> <li>- <b>The aim needs to be clearly specified and the article needs to very clearly meet this aim for the study to be acceptable. The aim is not delineated in the methodology.</b></li> <li>- <b>The author has failed to understand the concept of a p value and when this is necessary – WE DO NOT USE THIS FOR EVERYTHING i.e gender and age distribution etc. Statistical analysis is very superficial.</b></li> <li>- <b>Later in the study topics such as hydrocephalus and portal hypertension are mentioned – this is not discussed anywhere in the text.</b></li> <li>- <b>How was the diagnosis or choledochal cysts made? This is very relevant to the study, and it is discussed in the last section where the literature says MRCP can be used</b></li> <li>- <b>Tables 3 and 4 discuss “clinical features” and post operative complications – what are clinical features? These are also post operative complications and findings.</b></li> <li>- <b>Overall the study is too small – 36 patients over 5 years, statistical significance is hard with a population this small. The relevance of results is also then questionable</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>No, needs a lot of work to meet scholarly standards.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Please see above. Methodology is very flawed – this determines the quality of the study.</p>	

[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>Sheree Gray</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa</b>