

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71276
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on variation of origin of gastroduodenal artery
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>JPRI-71276</p> <p><b>A study on variation of origin of gastroduodenal artery</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Abstract: Line-2: <u>rare type of branching pattern</u> should be corrected as "rare type of origin" because the authors claim to have studied variation in origin of gastroduodenal artery and not its branching pattern.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Introduction: Line-11: <u>develop from trifurcation of right and left hepatic arteries</u> should be corrected as "arise from trifurcation of common hepatic artery" and in such cases the hepatic artery proper is absent.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Introduction: Line-15: [Reference numbers should be shown in superscript]</b></li> <li>4. <b>Introduction: Line-21: [Reference number 3 is totally irrelevant to the study. Delete it. The literature search is very poor, and the authors have quoted totally irrelevant references; delete reference numbers 6, 9, 10 and 13. Even reference number 5 is not relevant. Include more relevant references pertaining to variations in the origin of gastroduodenal and cystic arteries]</b></li> <li>5. <b>Results: Some important observations which are not described in the manuscript:-</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>Cystic artery was not passing through Calot's triangle; after its origin from GDA it crosses anterior to CBD, runs below and parallel to cystic duct to reach GB. Cystic artery is giving off a branch which passes downwards accompanying CBD. What is this branch?</b></li> <li>(b) <b>LHA after a short course divide into 2 branches; what do they supply? It is also giving off a branch which ascends and turns to left. What is it?</b></li> <li>(c) <b>A large branch is arising from GDA very close to its origin and descends obliquely to the left. Name of that branch?</b></li> <li>(d) <b>Because RHA and LHA are directly arising from CHA, hepatic artery proper is not present.</b></li> </ol> </li> <li>6. <b>Discussion: [Please check the reference numbers shown against the authors mentioned in the discussion; many appear to be wrong. The article mentioned against Anson pertains to aortic arch and its branches as mentioned by you. Harris and Pelligrini are not included in the reference list.]</b></li> <li>7. <b>Discussion is wayward, not focused and fails to include many important relevant references. Some relevant references are listed below.</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>Andall RG, et al. The clinical anatomy of cystic artery variations: a review of over 9800 cases. Surg Radiol Anat. 2016; DOI: 10.1007/s00276-015-1600-y</b></li> <li>(b) <b>Ding YM, et al. New classification of the anatomic variations of cystic</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>artery during laparoscopic cholecystectomy. World J Gastroenterol. 2007; 13: 5629-5634.</p> <p>(c) Celebioglu EC, Akkasoglu S. Anatomical variations of cystic artery: a digital subtraction angiography study. J Surg Med 2021; 5 (4): 358-361.</p> <p>(d) Skorzewska A, et al. Rare variations of hepatic arteries in association with variable origin of gastroduodenal artery found in multidetector computed tomography angiography. Folia Morphol. 2014; 73 (4): 531-535.</p> <p>8. Please revise and rewrite your manuscript based on above suggestions including recent, more relevant references and highlighting the various variations observed.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>C. S. Ramesh Babu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Muzaffarnagar Medical College, Chaudhary Charan Singh University, India</b>