

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This case report is about a very rare medical condition and is important to disseminate their knowledge regarding this condition. The reporter has selected a very interesting and rare case. I liked the content and the case for publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	Abstract is good and suitable.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Well-arranged and appropriate	
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.	It is a rare condition and only few case reports are available. Good topic to publish and well arranged manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He is a 22-year-old young man with no notable medical history. He was admitted with high intestinal obstruction without signs of gastrointestinal bleeding >> This section may be elaborated a little more and instead of high intestinal obstruction in such a case of proximal duodenal obstruction, the appropriate term should be Gastric outlet obstruction. The nature of presentation is most likely to be a long standing, gradually deteriorating features. 2. Why no Upper GI endoscopy done should be elaborated in the discussion part. 3. The CT film showing the lesion , if possible, should be given in the paper 4. The actual histopathology report should also be shown in the paper. 5. The surgical technique used, specially the relationship with ampulla of vatter, per operative measures to avoid duodenal content leakage and operative identification of the lesion and opening of the duodenum needs further clarification. 	

Review Form 3

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:	Hafizur Rashid Sazal
Department, University & Country	Combined Military Hospital (CMH) Dhaka, Bangladesh