Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJCRS_85457**
Title of the Manuscript:	**HETEROTOPIC PANCREAS IN A CHILD PRESENTING WITH INTUSSUSCEPTION: A 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.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors have reported on a case of a 12-year-old child presenting with intussusception. Post-operatively, the resected specimen revealed pancreatic tissue. I appreciate the authors for their effort. After reading the manuscript I have the following observations 1. Main text case report section – The authors state the child presented with an "acute onset pain abdomen in the epigastric region" and then "abdominal examination revealed a sausage-shaped mass in the epigastric region" whereas "the abdominal ultrasound revealed a loop of abnormal bowel in the pelvis extending to the right iliac fossa". Kindly throw light on the discrepancy. 2. When the child was clinically stable and the blood investigations were normal, why was he taken for an upfront laparotomy.? Why was an ultrasound guided saline or pneumatic reduction not tried? 3. The authors mention that the ileal intussusceptions were resected and a primary anastomosis was performed. Did they try reducing it on table first? If so why did they plan on table to resect the specimen? It is not mentioned. Was there a Meckel's diverticulum? 4. Discussion – The authors have mentioned about 3 prior reports of heterotopic pancreas causing intussusception. I suggest that he discuss his case with respect to these three reports. Is his the fourth such case or there are others reporting's? what are the similarities and differences with the previous cases need to be discussed. A collective review of reports with heterotopic pancreas presenting as intussusception can be done	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Abstract conclusion – The author states that they emphasize the early recognition and treatment of this condition to ensure the best possible prognosis. However, there is no proper mention of anything related to the above statement in either discussion or conclusion 2. There is no take home message	
Optional/General 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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Nitin Pant**
Department, University & Country	**King George`s Medical University, India**