Review Form2

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3553
Title of the Manuscript:	Multiple paragangliomas involving carotid body and vagal region: A sporadic case
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(P part in the manuscript. his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In this article, the author presents a case of simultaneous bilateral carotid and left vagal paraganglioma. The author notes that multiple paraganglioma is a rare condition. This article offers an important contribution to the literature on this rare condition, which will be of value to clinicians in their evaluation and management of such cases.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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.	It was unnecessary to provide such comprehensive detail about the case in the abstract. Instead, an introduction could have been given about the clinic, diagnosis and treatment of multiple paragangliomas, with the statement that a case of multiple paragangliomas was discussed in this article.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article was structured into the following sections: introduction, methodology, patient recruitment, case report, discussion and conclusion. The sections were sufficient in themselves; however, the section on patient recruitment was not appropriately placed before the case report. It would have been more appropriate to include the complications, etc. explained to the patient before surgery in the case report.	
scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do	In this case report, neck computed tomography was employed as the radiological modality, and only bilateral carotid paragangliomas were diagnosed prior to surgical intervention. Intraoperatively, a simultaneous diagnosis of a left vagal paraganglioma was established. It is noteworthy that the preoperative computed tomography did not diagnose the vagal paraganglioma. In the existing literature, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is also recommended for the diagnosis of paraganglioma. Radiotherapy is also a crucial element in the management of patients with multiple paragangliomas. It is notable that the role of radiotherapy in this study was not sufficiently elucidated.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The number of references was sufficient and the references themselves were up to date. Nevertheless, there was a notable recurrence of the same reference (e.g. reference 6). On several occasions, the same numbered reference was repeated in the same paragraph. This constitutes both a technical error and a potential case of plagiarism.	

Please correct the manuscript and highlight that t. It is mandatory that authors should write e)			

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	While there were some minor errors, the English used was generally appropriate for academic purposes.	
Optional/Generalcomments		

<u>PART 2:</u>

		Author's comment(if a highlight that part in the write his/her feedback
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aybala Nur Ucgul
Department, University & Country	Health Science University, Turkey

(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should ck here)