

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_128374
Title of the Manuscript:	macrocystic serous cystadenoma of the body and tail of the pancreas in a young subject: case report
Type of the Article	Case report

**PART 1: 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>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is good case report considering it's rarity and the location/importance of organ of affectation.</li> <li>2. It is also useful as it could be confused with other pancreatic macrocystitic leisions that has malignant potentials.</li> <li>3. It can stimulate the scientific community to research on ways of making pre-operative diagnosis.</li> </ol>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Macrocytic Serous Cystadenoma of the Body and Tail of The Pancreas in a Young Subject: Case Report and Literature Review	
<b>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.</b>	Not comprehensive enough. A few more information on the subject is needed here.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes, it is.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, they are.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The language/English quality (especially in the case presentation) is not suitable for scholarly communication. The report should be unambiguous, simple and synchronous.</li> <li>2. An arrow should be pointed at the tumour in the CT scan and MRI pictures.</li> <li>3. A lot of non-standard acronyms are being used without first writing them in full.</li> <li>4. Histologic slides of the tumour should form part of the pictures for this manuscript.</li> <li>5. Sentences in a scientific paper should not begin with acronyms.</li> <li>5. The case presentation is not scientific enough and contains lots of inappropriate punctuation marks as are also numerous in the discussion.</li> <li>6. The message in the manuscript (especially in the discussion) is not synchronous.</li> <li>7. References numbers 2 and 4 are the same.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The manuscript is a good one but the writer can do a better organization of the work including proper use of punctuation marks to tell the story in 'an easy to understand 'manner.</p> <p>I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Otobo Odezi Fidelis</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Calabar Teaching Hospital, Nigeria</b>