



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_47238
Title of the Manuscript:	MINIMALLY INVASIVE OPEN THYROIDECTOMY: Our Experience-A case series.
Type of the Article	Case series

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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 describe their experience of minimally invasive thyreoidectomy in seven cases. The article is well structured, cases are well described, I would complete just Bethesda of FNAC. Inform which suture you performed (intradermic?). Table 2 has no title, no number and is not cited in the text, please complete. The discussion is very nice, referring since history to up-date knowledge about different techniques. Formally , you have the patients's consent, but as you a re publishing their data, and some ethic commission also include case reports/case series reports as necessary for approval (please complete these informations).	
Minor REVISION comments	Some spellings should be revised, mostly use of principle letters, lack of the article "the", and some plurals.	
Optional/General comments	Good report	

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) Authors submitted a patient's consent, but did not explain if there was ethic approval or if ethic commission dispensed as it is a case series report.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Silke Anna Theresa Weber</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Sao Paulo State University, Brazil</i>