

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_89148
Title of the Manuscript:	Recurrent intestinal obstruction in a teenager with a classic case of Peutz-Jeghers syndrome: 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.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/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	<p>This manuscript describes how, through a clinical study and diagnostic tests, the diagnosis of adenocarcinoma was achieved as the cause of intestinal obstruction suffered by a patient affected by recurrent intestinal obstruction associated with a case of Peutz-Jeghers syndrome (PJS).</p> <p>The work presents a good description of the background of the case and of the studies and technical-surgical and therapeutic procedures carried out in this case. However, in relation to the methodological part to obtain the diagnosis of the case, and in terms of results and discussion, the work presents deficiencies that should be commented on.</p> <p>The authors mention that Giardiello et al (1987), refers to the criteria for the diagnosis of PJS; however, it seems to me that there is currently a need to include molecular studies as in Wangler et al., (2013) (J Pediatr Hematol Oncol 2013;35:323–328). This is important because there are other causes of polyps.</p> <p>Likewise, in the introduction there is no reference to the molecular part of the syndrome. I'm not sure if then the authors could use their case as: PJS-like case?.</p> <p>The conclusion of the abstract is general, it is not a conclusion of the case described in the text.</p> <p>In method they do not refer to any molecular process.</p> <p>In Results, a description of the histological changes observed is made; however, they do not clearly refer to which of the 4 photographs in Number 2 figure they refer to. Here they should be more punctual. Likewise, in the legend of the figure 2 they should indicate with arrows or symbols what is described. They should also improve the photos. I think it would be a good to include more panoramic photos, and even a macroscopic photo.</p> <p>Why include information on the genes associated with polyps in the Discussion, if nothing molecular was done in this study? that is, there is nothing to argue about it.</p> <p>At work they do not justify that the final diagnosis is 100% accurate, they do not discuss it, or other situations or causes of polyps. (Laugier-Hunziker syndrome: an important differential diagnosis for Peutz-Jeghers syndrome. A K Lampe, P J Hampton, K Woodford-Richens, I Tomlinson, C M Lawrence, F S Douglas: J Med Genet 2003;40:e77(http://www.jmedgenet.com/cgi/content/full/40/6/e77)).</p> <p>The conclusion is not a conclusion of the analyzed case.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cesar Ortega Santana
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, Mexico