

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58295

Title: *Pancréatite aigüe gravidique ; une série de 24 cas et revue de la littérature*

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 but clinically important obstetric condition
- Five years of hospital experience adds practical value
- Clinical presentation, investigations, treatment, and outcomes are well described
- Relevant literature is compared with the study findings
- Maternal and fetal outcomes are clearly presented
- The manuscript has useful clinical relevance for obstetric practice
- The conclusions are consistent with the reported findings

Weakness of the study:

- The sample size is relatively small
- The retrospective design limits the strength of conclusions
- Ethical clearance and patient consent are not clearly stated
- Statistical analysis is limited and requires more detail
- Some tables and figures need better formatting
- Minor grammatical and language corrections are required
- The discussion could better explain study limitations and future research directions

Reviewers Comments:

This manuscript presents a retrospective case series of pregnancy-associated acute pancreatitis with a useful review of the literature. The topic is important because the condition is uncommon and early diagnosis is essential for improving maternal and fetal outcomes. The manuscript is generally well organized, and the clinical findings are presented in a logical manner. However, the authors should clearly mention approval from the institutional ethics committee and describe whether informed consent was obtained or waived due to the retrospective nature of the study. The statistical methods should be explained in greater detail, and the limitations of the small sample size and single-center design should be discussed more thoroughly. Minor grammatical errors and formatting inconsistencies should also be corrected to improve readability. Overall, the study contributes valuable clinical experience and can be considered for publication after appropriate minor revisions.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original clinical study supported by relevant published references. No obvious indication of duplicate publication or extensive copied content was identified during this review. A standard plagiarism similarity check by the journal is recommended before publication to confirm originality and ensure compliance with publication ethics.