

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_84571
Title of the Manuscript:	A Mass Occupied In Neck Carotid Bifurcation Territory
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>In this manuscript, the authors report a case study of a patient presenting with a mass in the right neck that was diagnosed as sebaceous adenocarcinoma. It is an interesting report, however I have a few considerations to improve quality and clarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- There are some problems in language and spelling. A throughout checking is recommended.- The title could be improved to be clearer and more understandable.- The supplementary data mentioned in the manuscript are missing.- The authors should further discuss Fig. B, mainly highlighting the findings obtained by the histological analysis.- In the abstract, the authors mention that the pathological diagnosis of the case was sebaceous adenocarcinoma. However, in the discussion section they state that the final conclusion still needs pathological diagnosis.- A statement of ethical consent was not provided. Authors must indicate in the manuscript whether informed consent was obtained from the patient.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Described above	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Described above.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Burgarelli Lages
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil