



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJMMR_23842</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Paraganglioma of Carotid Body: A Case Report</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</b>

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>1. Major revision of syntax and English expression (Native reviewer)</b></p> <p><b>2. Results: There are no figures of CT examination. Why the authors did not use a CT or MR angiography for preoperative planning?</b></p> <p><b>3. Discussion: The authors should discuss the proper diagnostic modality for preoperative planning. Why did they use digital angiography? They should discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each modality.</b></p> <p><b>4. Discussion: the authors selected surgery. Recently, many authors have advocated preoperative embolization of the carotid body tumour. They could discuss why they did not select it and potential indications.</b></p> <p><b>5. Discussion: The authors mention the Shamblin classification. This is a histological classification. What other radiological classifications could be used preoperatively?</b></p>	Ok.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		