

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58198

Title: *Perioperative Management of Pheochromocytoma: A Report of 5 Cases*

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

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The study addresses a rare and clinically important anesthetic condition
- Prospective study design improves the quality of data collection
- Perioperative management is described in a clear and practical manner
- Clinical outcomes are presented systematically
- The discussion is supported by relevant published literature
- The conclusions have direct implications for anesthetic practice
- The manuscript is concise and easy to follow

Weakness of the study:

- The sample size is very small and limits the strength of conclusions
- Ethical clearance and informed consent are not clearly mentioned
- Single center design limits generalizability of the findings
- Statistical analysis is mainly descriptive
- Tables summarizing patient characteristics would improve presentation
- Minor grammatical and language corrections are required
- Long term postoperative follow up is not available

Reviewers Comments:

This manuscript presents a prospective case series describing the perioperative management of pheochromocytoma, a rare but clinically significant endocrine disorder with major anesthetic challenges. The topic is relevant, and the manuscript provides useful practical information regarding preoperative preparation, intraoperative hemodynamic management, and postoperative care. The methodology is appropriate for a case series, and the discussion is supported by established literature. However, the manuscript should clearly mention institutional ethical clearance and informed patient consent, as these are essential components of clinical research reporting. The very small sample size and single center design should be emphasized as important limitations affecting the generalizability of the findings. A summary table comparing individual patient characteristics and outcomes would improve clarity. Minor grammatical errors and formatting inconsistencies should also be corrected. Overall, the manuscript contributes valuable clinical experience and is suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be original, and no obvious evidence of duplicate publication or copied material was identified during this review. No apparent signs of plagiarism were observed in the submitted version. However, the journal should perform a routine plagiarism similarity check before final acceptance to confirm originality and ensure compliance with publication ethics.