

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_130807
Title of the Manuscript:	Dieulafoy's Surprise: An Unexpected Source of Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding - A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a good topic on upper gi bleeding . There should be given drug history in the introduction whether patient was on NSAIDS and anticoagulants or other cocomittant medications that may cause drug interactions and leading to cause of upper gi bleeding . How the diagnosis was made to be mentioned . How they manage before surgery to be mentioned . As it is having risk of bleeding and serious Ness full board review of ethics committee to be done	Patient did not have any drug history; diagnosis was made via endoscopy. Due to clinical signs endoscopy was done.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Keep title short and crispy	Not Applicable due to other reviewers' approval, if any further changes needed we will look forward to it.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In abstract there should be background, methodology, result , discussion, conclusion , keywords sub headings	Abstract is updated.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	There should be proper medical management history before surgery .Some modification required	There was no medical management as we have mentioned earlier. Patient experienced vomiting blood. We rushed to upper endoscopy as it was diagnostic and therapeutic.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References can be increased up to 20-25 by searching different articles published on similar topics on upper gi bleeding management	Based on the other reviewer's comment the discussion part is bit too much told us to make it brief around 5-6 references, we would like to keep discussiom part unchanged.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quality may be increased slightly. Margins are not maintained in manuscript ,arbitrary writing .	Edited the entire document.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Go through different articles on good journals on this type of topic and guidelines of management of upper gi bleeding to modify your case report properly .	Changes has been applied according to the comment mentioned by Reviewer.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	