

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_127596
Title of the Manuscript:	Malignant Retro Rectal Tumor: Two Compelling Case Reports
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important because it sheds light on two rare presacral tumours, as they are usually benign and appears in early age. They are also difficult to diagnosis due to their location can cause a variety of symptoms, which could mislead the clinicians.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable enough	
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.	Okay from my side	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Only one is from 2021. Rest of them are pretty old. I can understand the rarity of the cases, so these references should be enough.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some grammatical mistakes, which I have pointed out in the main manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I strongly believe that the author should have included the photomicrograph of the histopathology, as features of sarcomas can be overlapping and confusing.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sayedatus saba
Department, University & Country	Dhaka Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh