

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_123210
Title of the Manuscript:	Brunner's Gland Hamartoma of the Duodenum: Case report
Type of the Article	Case report

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	Case reports of Brunner's gland hamartomas are crucial for a better understanding of this rare pathology, which can mimic other gastrointestinal conditions. They provide valuable details on the diagnosis, management, and outcomes of individual cases, aiding physicians in their identification and treatment. Additionally, they allow for the comparison of therapeutic approaches, such as endoscopic versus surgical management. This helps to optimize treatment strategies and improve clinical outcomes for patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is an acceptable title; however, I suggest this alternative: "Brunner's Gland Hamartoma of the Duodenum as a Cause of Intestinal Obstruction in a Young Patient: Surgical Approach."	
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 is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust as it highlights the importance of better understanding this rare pathology. It provides valuable details on the diagnosis, management, and outcomes of individual cases, contributing to a deeper understanding of the topic. Additionally, it appropriately addresses the surgical approach for treating hamartomas and includes relevant literary references that enhance the discussion and comprehension of the subject.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mumtaz R, Shah IA, Ramirez FC. "Brunner's gland hamartoma simulating a pancreatic mass with duodenal obstruction." <i>Gastrointest Endosc.</i> 2002;56:932-4 2. Delvecchio K, Seman S. "Successful surgical excision of a massive symptomatic partially obstructing Brunner's gland hamartoma: a case report." <i>J Surg Case Rep.</i> 2016 Dec 18;2016(12) 3. Dhali A, Ray S, Mandal TS, et al. "Surgical Outcome of Brunner's Gland Hamartoma: A Single-Centre Experience." <i>Surg J (N Y).</i> 2022 Jan 17;8(1) 	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>A thorough review was conducted of the manuscript "Brunner's Gland Hamartoma of the Duodenum: Case Report." I consider that the data presented in the introduction are adequate, particularly in highlighting the important distinction between hyperplasia and hamartoma. However, I suggest evaluating and modifying the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incidence: I recommend conducting a more detailed investigation into the incidence of Brunner's gland hamartomas using more recent data. For example, Mumtaz et al. (2002) mention that Brunner's gland hamartomas are relatively rare, found in less than 1 in 10,000 individuals, and account for approximately 5% of all duodenal tumors (Mumtaz R, Shah IA, Ramirez FC. "Brunner's gland hamartoma simulating a pancreatic mass with duodenal obstruction." <i>Gastrointest Endosc.</i> 2002;56:932-4). • Case Description: I suggest providing a more detailed description of the surgical technique used in the case presented, to enhance the readers' understanding of the approach and specific details of the procedure. • Discussion on Treatment: In the discussion section, it would be beneficial to expand the treatment section to include indications, possible complications, advantages, and disadvantages of both endoscopic and surgical approaches. It is also recommended to describe the experience of the case based on the surgical technique employed and provide a more detailed explanation of why an endoscopic management approach was not chosen. Additionally, it may be useful to comment on and compare the experience of this approach with a similar management described in 2016 (Delvecchio K, Seman S. "Successful surgical excision of a massive symptomatic partially obstructing Brunner's gland hamartoma: a case report." <i>J Surg Case Rep.</i> 2016 Dec 18;2016(12)). • Surgical Outcomes: In the discussion section, it is suggested to emphasize the surgical outcomes by citing, comparing, and describing the findings of the article by Dhali et al. (2022) on the surgical outcomes of Brunner's gland hamartomas (Dhali A, Ray S, Mandal TS, et al. "Surgical Outcome of Brunner's Gland Hamartoma: A Single-Centre Experience." <i>Surg J (N Y).</i> 2022 Jan 17;8(1)). 	

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>Celina Gonzalez Peña</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Instituto Mexicano Del Seguro Social, Mexico</p>