

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_125099
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidental highly differentiated neuroendocrine tumor (NET, G1) of the appendix in a 16 years-old boy
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The presentation of the case in this manuscript is very interesting and has a scientific aspect. It was highly significant to me that this research was done in one cohort.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be corrected ``Highly differentiated neuroendocrine tumor of the appendix".	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of this manuscript is not adequate. It is not comprehensive. The summary must be completely edited and written. It must include why this condition is significant, what the clinical presentation and treatment of this patient is (briefly), and a conclusion with guidelines (briefly).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction: In the sentence "NEN classification varies...", state what the abbreviation NEN actually means. State how the diagnosis is made and what treatment options are available. After that, write a sentence about the purpose of this case presentation at the end of the "Introduction". There is no reference in the "Introduction"?! What's going on?</p> <p>Classification: You have not provided references as the source of the data you provided regarding the classification. It would be better to create a classification table, for example.</p> <p>Case report: How did you diagnose acute appendicitis? Describe the method and diagnostics. You did a diagnostic laparoscopy, does that mean you weren't sure it was appendicitis, so you did the exploration? You didn't describe why you did the exploration. It must be clear to the readers. Transfer the laboratory parameters during hospitalization to the part of the paragraph that refers to the preoperative period. You describe abdominal pain. What was the intensity of the pain? What was the key parameter that made you enter the operating room? Describe in detail the entire patient presentation as it is a very important part of the manuscript. I hope you have pictures of macroscopic and microscopic preparations to insert in this manuscript.</p> <p>Discussion: Pay attention to the abbreviated words and their meaning. List the strengths and weaknesses of this manuscript.</p> <p>Conclusion: References are NEVER written in this chapter. Everything you wrote in this chapter should be written in the Discussion. The conclusion of this manuscript should be based on the facts obtained from the pathohistological analysis of the preparation, and the oncological facts of this case report. There should also be guidelines for the future, especially when this disease is suspected.</p>	

Review Form 3

Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Upon completion of the entire proofreading of the manuscript, the technical editor must review the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient. They are more recent.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It's okay.	
Optional/General comments	/	

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:	Gojko Igrutinović
Department, University & Country	University of Pristina, Serbia