

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55982

Title: Sump Syndrome: A Rare but Persistent Complication of Choledochoduodenostomy

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Date: 30.01.26

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study:

- **Originality and Relevance:** The manuscript addresses a rare but clinically significant long-term complication of biliary surgery, specifically sump syndrome following choledochoduodenostomy. It emphasizes the importance of awareness for early diagnosis and management, contributing valuable insights to the literature.
- **Case Presentation:** Provides a detailed and illustrative case report that highlights clinical, imaging, and endoscopic findings with supporting figures.
- **Imaging and Diagnostic Approach:** Emphasizes the role of MRCP and ERCP in diagnosing sump syndrome, reinforcing current best practices.
- **Literature Integration:** The discussion places the case in context with existing literature, citing relevant references to reinforce the points made.

Weaknesses of the Study:

- **Limited Scope:** As a single case report, the generalizability of findings is inherently limited.
- **Absence of Long-term Follow-up Data:** No information on the patient's long-term outcome after intervention is provided.
- **Lack of Detailed Methodology:** The paper does not describe the specific ethical approval process, informed consent, or hospital approval details.
- **Reference Currency:** Most references date from 1990-2019, with some older references; inclusion of the latest studies or guidelines could enhance the report.
- **Language and Clarity:** Minor grammatical and typographical errors are present, affecting the overall language quality.

Reviewer Comments:

- **Title and Abstract:** The title is appropriate and descriptive. However, the abstract could be clearer in summarizing the case details, findings, and implications. Including specific clinical findings and management outcomes would improve clarity.
- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction adequately explains the background and significance. Clearer articulation of the aim or hypothesis at the end of the introduction would provide better guidance for readers.
- **Methodology and Statistical Analysis:** As a case report, detailed methodology is less relevant; however, clarification regarding ethical approval, patient consent, and the process of data collection would strengthen the paper.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Results and Discussion:** The case presentation is comprehensive and well-illustrated. The discussion successfully contextualizes the findings within current literature, though it could be expanded to discuss differential diagnoses and management options more thoroughly.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusions are appropriate and reinforce the importance of considering sump syndrome in relevant patients. A brief mention of preventive strategies post-surgery could be added.
- **Ethical Considerations:** The manuscript does not specify whether ethical approval was obtained or if patient consent was secured, which are essential for case reports.
- **Language and Presentation:** The manuscript is generally well-written but would benefit from proofreading to correct minor grammatical errors and improve flow.
- **Figures and Formatting:** Figures are relevant and clearly labeled. The formatting aligns with standard formats. References are appropriately cited in Vancouver style but could include more recent literature.
- **Novelty and Prior Publication Check:** Based on the current search and available data, there is no evidence suggesting this exact case report or detailed discussion has been previously published online. However, given the commonality of case reports in literature, an in-depth literature search prior to submission is recommended to confirm originality.

Additional Note: Based on the review of the content provided and standard practices for scholarly publications, there are no indications or evidence within the text suggesting that this particular study has been previously published on the internet or elsewhere. To conclusively verify whether this work has been previously published, a dedicated plagiarism check or database search (e.g., PubMed, Google Scholar, or institutional repositories) would be necessary.