

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_83979
Title of the Manuscript:	GASTRIC SCHWANNOMA: CASE REPORT AND LITERATURE REVIEW
Type of the Article	CASE REPORT

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.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p><u>There</u> are significant grammatical mistakes which need to be rectified before final acceptance. E.g. Kindly rephrase sentence in introduction</p> <p>They account for about 0.2% of all gastric tumors and are the most common site within the GIT</p> <p>Instead of writing that “it is usually diagnosed by histopathology “, they should write that histopathology is gold standard/ a definite diagnosis is given on histopathology .</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>When author describes the FNAC findings, it has been commented that mitosis were high... however in Histopathology they write that it was low. This poses as a discrepancy. Similarly in discussion part, they claim that CECT can easily differentiate between schwannoma and GIST, however in their case it was not diagnosed, hence please rephrase this also.</p>	<p>The FNAC was done in another centre and patient presented to us with the report. The slides of the same could not be retrieved for analysis at our centre and thus the validity of the report is questionable. Duly noted the point on CECT. Has missed to add one line. I have made the appropriate changes.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Good article, accept after revisions</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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)	No