

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_92549
Title of the Manuscript:	Giant pancreatic pseudocyst complicating twin pregnancy with spontaneous resolution: case report
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Needs restructuring of sentences and avoidance of vague terminologies like <b>codified</b> in the abstract.</li><li>Case report section needs serious revision. Lots of grammatical errors make it unappealing in the current form, tense needs uniformity.</li><li>Cyst characters in detail on imaging would be informative.</li><li>What were the differentials considered after imaging and how were they subsequently ruled out?</li><li>What were the important factors considered in deciding the current line of management since the manuscript already states that no standardized protocol exists?</li><li>Why was pig tail drainage not considered when diagnostic aspiration was being performed? Or endoluminal drainage of the cyst!</li><li>How was the follow up period decided? How frequently and what all parameters were evaluated?</li><li>These patients often present with features of Extrinsic Gastric Outlet Obstruction, was it the case here and if yes, what was done? Is not that a problem with an over distended Uterus due to multiple pregnancy to start with (hyperemesis)?</li><li>What happened to the eventual outcome of pregnancy? Were the babies delivered safely? Any peripartum difficulties?</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>The sentences were restructured.</li><li>Modifications were made.</li><li>Radiologists advice was asked for, modifications made.</li><li>At the time we received the patient, MRI was already done, EKG and Pulmonary MRI also, so we added them to the case, thank you for reminding us.</li><li>It is the main goal the paper, to push clinicians to look after these kind of cases, to put on decisional algorithms, we stated our therapeutic management since we discussed the case with our professoral staff.</li><li>Good point, the reassuring evolution of the pancreatitis as long as the twin pregnancy, was the main motivation of the conservative treatment, since we put on the patient on parenteral nutrition, digestive rest with close monitoring.</li><li>Before the delivery, the patient was hospitalised in High Risk Pregnancy Unit, daily check up were made, after delivery, a trimester examination was done in the first year, the patient was out of sight afterwards.</li><li>No extrinsic gastric obstruction was reported.</li><li>Delivery was safe, the twin babies were in good health.</li></ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Pseudocysts are preferably linked with pancreatitis of any aetiology, trauma being one of them and unknown causes being more common, in the introduction part. This has to be reframed.</li><li>MRI does not mention the site of the cyst, it says at expense of entire pancreas, this needs to be clarified further, also information on main and accessory pancreatic duct dimensions, any calculi or space occupying lesions is important.</li></ol>	Modifications were made, thank you.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Article is a good initiative but has inadequate information, would suggest a serious revision to fill up the potential lacunae of information and to present a more comprehensive understanding of the patient details.	

### 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?	(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	This case report is exempt from ethical approval at our institution.