

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_114597
Title of the Manuscript:	Lateral Pectus Carinatum and prognosis analysis: A case report
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>Yes, but sister condition pectus excavatum might be discussed in brief to compare, repetition of same facts making a case report quite large to read</p> <p>yes</p> <p>should be written in paragraphic form representing idea belief about the case. Conceptualized intellectually</p> <p>case presentation is too brief</p> <p>yes but facts are mentioned in a too discrete way and many unuseful things are written in between which should be minimizes to make this work more meaningful</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is too big for a case report The conservative management should be discussed more clearly and under section of case report The condition like p excavatum should have been discussed in discussion section The cosmetic correction of condition should be discussed along with CDT as patient was going gym Conclusion is not clearly written about CDT use, both statement are contradictory, if there was no pandemic than, Cdt might have not been used. So study is showing its limited use.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanjeev Kumar Sharma
Department, University & Country	Rajiv Gandhi Government Postgraduate Ayurvedic College, India