

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_94790
Title of the Manuscript:	Idiopathic post-Gastropexy ileo-ileal intussusception. A Case report and review of literature
Type of the Article	Case study

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:

(<https://www.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Structure the summary. It should be included: A brief context, the problem being discussed in the work, the objectives, the methodology and the main results and conclusions.</p> <p>Introduction:The beginning of the introduction should present a synthesis of the proposal, with the reasons that justify the choice of the theme: what motivated him to choose his theme of study, what is the usefulness of the results obtained by the research, what is the purpose of the proposal. A text introducing the subject to be studied should be used, with at least two paragraphs. In the introduction it is very important to present the research problem, expressed in a paragraph that presents the problem of your research, because then the reader will understand what motivated the current research. It is essential that the issues that will be developed throughout the work are introduced.</p> <p>Methodology: It is necessary for the authors to enter the methodology of the work, which is the description of the detailed path that you will use to explain how you did your research and what methods you used to reach the result. The methodology reports in detail how the construction of your work will be. It is through it that the reader of your study will know how you did your research, if your results are verifiable and reliable. That part is very important. Authors should be aware of the reproducibility of the study and the way it was presented, it is not possible to guarantee that a new research achieves similar results. Database names must be described in full before abbreviations are used. Ensure that if someone repeats the methodology described by you, you can achieve similar results. The final sample of articles is insufficient for the statements that the study proposes, especially if we consider the amount of studies available on the theme studied.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: An organized presentation facilitates the reader's understanding of your line of reasoning I suggest that the discussion be inserted, remember that this part is important in your work, because it does show the relevance of your work. In this section you should interpret the data and perform a critical analysis. The objectives and research questions are answered in this excerpt of the work because it establishes a link between what was described in the introduction, with what was found with the use of its methodology. It is necessary to make a critical evaluation of its results, comparing them with findings from similar studies and describe how their data contribute to the understanding or advancement of their field of research. The implications of their results and limitations of their work also need to be described clearly and objectively. However, do not repeat the information already presented or describe new results in the discussion section.</p> <p>Final considerations: Due to the changes that must be made to the rest of the work, the final considerations will need to be rewritten. Remember to make it clear whether or not the study objective was achieved. Write a final paragraph that describes the limitations in the study, as well as suggestions for future work.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Format and insert in the study in the standards of the journal.	
Optional/General comments	I suggest accepting the work, after a few improvements have been made. The study addresses a relevant theme, is with an easy-to-understand writing and will add more knowledge on the subject.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luana de Oliveira Hernandes
Department, University & Country	ABRENC, Brazil