

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77345
Title of the Manuscript:	Surgical Management of Benign Gastric Tumors; Review Article
Type of the Article	Review 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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

### 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>1. I find that the position in the article is at the end of every natural paragraph. This method can appear, but the full text quotation is not appropriate. It should be inserted into the appropriate location according to the different references cited, hoping that the author will modify it.</p> <p>2. The purpose of this article is to discuss benign gastrointestinal tumors. The second paragraph of the preface is a direct discussion of GISTs, so the relationship between the two is logically incoherent.</p> <p>3. "Benign gastric and duodenal tumors are uncommon. It only accounts for 5-10% of all gastric tumors and 10-20% of all duodenal tumors." But duodenal tumors should be cited. GISTs are most commonly detected in the stomach (55.6 percent), small bowel (31.8 percent), and less frequently in the colon and rectum (6 percent), other diverse places (5.5 percent), and the oesophagus (0.7 percent). This description is not in conformity with the description in the abstract.</p> <p>4. For imaging diagnosis of benign gastrointestinal tumors, it only describes the value of CT, which is far from enough. It is suggested to increase other modalities.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. There are tense and grammatical errors in the article, which need further modification.</p> <p>2. The number of references cited in the article is not enough, so it is suggested to increase</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

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

**Review Form 1.6**

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Xinghao Wang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shengjing Hospital of China Medical University, China</b>