



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_50669
Title of the Manuscript:	Carpal tunnel syndrome caused by anatomic anomalies muscles; a three cases 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:

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



SDI 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>Carpal tunnel syndrome caused by anatomic anomalies muscles; a three cases report I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p>Review of the literature: Two different types of literature review research are available: systematic review and non-systematic review or narrative review (update). The traditional method of review of the literature has been the narrative review, but it has two basic weaknesses. First, there is no rule on how to obtain primary data and how to integrate results; that is the subjective criterion of the reviewer. Second, the narrative reviewer does not synthesize quantitatively the data found in the different publications; therefore, these revisions are very susceptible to inaccuracies and biases.</p> <p>-Discussion: It should be understood as the presentation of infrequent or rare case. The author could mention something more about how this case can help the understanding of a more important issue, or remember certain messages, or motivate the search for more information. It should be shown that this "anecdotal" publication is an important teaching tool. The aim of the publication of clinical cases is basically educational, author should keep in mind the message he wants to communicate and whether this knowledge will be useful to readers. Perhaps it may represent a description of a sentinel event; this may be a warning to put on alert for similar situations; and/or stimulate the generation of other studies.</p> <p>-References: Review, please, the rules of the Journal. There are references in which the journal is missing (for example, the number 9). The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals)</p> <p>For example: Acta orthopaedica Belgica. NLM Title Abbreviation: Acta Orthop Belg</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	Jose Luis Turabian
Department, University & Country	Regional Health Service of Castilla la Mancha (SESCAM), Toledo, Spain