

**Polya partial gastrectomy for megaduodenum: A case report.**Ullah ASMO. ([walisaleh@gmail.com](mailto:walisaleh@gmail.com))

<b>Executive Editor's comments (8-Apr-23)</b>		<b>Author's response (11-Apr-23)</b> <i>Please respond to all comments from the editor and reviewer(s). Indicate the line number(s) of the manuscript where the changes are done.</i>
1. Your manuscript needs a Major Revision. Format the manuscript according to the Checklist attached. We have edited the title for your consideration.		1. Thank you for your feedback. I acknowledge the need for a major revision and formatted the manuscript according to the Checklist. Also agreed with the revised title.
2. The objective is not clear. Make a clear statement of objectives.		2. Revised the objective.
3. Add an Abstract (max word count: 150).		3. Given an abstract.
4. Please reduce the word count of the main text to 1000.		4. Reduced the word count as possible.
5. The Journal uses Introduction, Case description, Case management, and Discussion headings. The manuscript does not have any text for case management.		5. I have revised the manuscript to align with the Journal's format, incorporating sections for Introduction, Case Description, Case Management, and Discussion. The content now includes the necessary information under the Case Management heading as per your recommendation.
6. Use maximum 2 figures.		6. Reduced the Figures number and now it's two.
7. Add a CARE checklist.		7. Added.
<b>Editor's Decision</b>	a. Minor revision	
	b. Major revision	√
	c. Reject	

<b>Reviewer's comments</b>		<b>Author's response</b>	
Date review assigned	01-Dec-22	Date sent to author	08-Apr-23
Date review returned	04-Dec-22	Date received from author	11-Apr-23
Reviewer name, affiliation, email, ORCID	Prof. SM Ashraf Ali Dept. of Surgery Marine City Medical College & Hospital <a href="mailto:ashrafali1975@yahoo.com">ashrafali1975@yahoo.com</a>		
Conflict of interest of the reviewer	No		
<b>Please write Yes or No</b>		Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is No. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.	
1. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	No	Revised the objective (Page 1).	
2. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	No	Given abstract (Page 2).	
3. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	No	Revised objective aligning with the title (Page 4).	
4. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	Yes	-	
5. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	Yes	-	
6. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	Yes	-	
7. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	NA	-	

8. Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	No	Aligned the findings with the objective.
9. Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	Yes	-
10. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes	-
11. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	NA	
12. Are the conclusions justified by the results	Yes	-
13. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	No	All references are updated.
14. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	No	Thoroughly revised the case report to enhance the overall quality of the English writing.
15. <b>Descriptive comments</b> to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.
<b>Major points:</b> Suggested changes or revisions 1. Introduction should have recent references.  2. Introduction has incorporated part of the case description. It should be removed.  3. In page 4, line 19 ----- the case presented on 06.05.22. Probably it is note correct, not supporting the date of operation ----2021-----  4. Description of cases, operative steps need to be concise, avoiding repetition.  5. Most references are very old.		<b>Major points:</b> 1. Updated the Introduction section with recent references to enhance the relevance of the content. 2. The portion of the case description in the Introduction has been removed as per your suggestion to maintain clarity and structure. 3. I have corrected the date discrepancy on page 4, line 19, aligning it with the accurate date of the operation in 2021. 4. The description of cases and operative steps has been revised for conciseness, addressing the issue of repetition. 5. Incorporated more recent references in the manuscript.
<b>Minor points</b> 1. Need to avoid repetition.		<b>Minor points</b> 1. Reduced repeated sentences.
<b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b>	a. Minor revision	
	b. Major revision	√
	c. Reject	