



Paper: “A Rare Case of Caecal Desmoid Tumor”

Submitted: 29 September 2024

Accepted: 18 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Amor Ayoub

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n6p17

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yaser Adnan Abo Jeesh
Faculty of Medicine, University of Gezira – Sudan

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes. The title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript, emphasizing the rarity of the caecal desmoid tumor and aligning well with the detailed case report.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Partially. The abstract provides a general overview of the case, including the clinical presentation, diagnostic process, and outcome. However:

Some details about the methods, such as how the diagnosis was confirmed, could be summarized more succinctly.

Minor grammatical issues, such as "The MRI demonstrated an 126x117x68 mm" (should be "a 126x117x68 mm"), detract slightly from clarity.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes. The manuscript contains several grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and inconsistent phrasing.

These errors should be corrected for better readability and professionalism.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Partially. The methods, particularly the surgical and histopathological procedures, are clearly described. The use of immunohistochemistry and specific markers is detailed and appropriate. However:

The inclusion of references to imaging criteria and genetic testing could be organized more systematically to improve flow.

A brief mention of alternative diagnostic methods or treatment approaches might enhance completeness.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Partially. The body is generally clear and informative, but:

There are frequent typographical errors and formatting inconsistencies.

Some sentences are overly long and could benefit from restructuring for clarity (e.g., in the

discussion section).

Terminology should be standardized throughout.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion should be more comprehensive to reflect the content, emphasizing the rarity, diagnostic challenges, and need for awareness of caecal desmoid tumors. Suggestions for genetic counseling and screening are logical and well-supported.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are relevant, recent, and comprehensive. However, some citations are incomplete (e.g., missing URLs for online sources). Standardized formatting should be applied throughout the reference list.

References should be appropriately aligned with their corresponding paragraphs.

All references must adhere to the APA style guidelines.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
