

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_92164
Title of the Manuscript:	A Rare Case of Post Cholecystectomy Cholecysto-cutaneous Fistula with Concomitant Common Bile Duct Stone
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>)

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	1- Meets the criteria of the clinical case report guidelines (CARE). 2- Suggest before making the surgical decision to abide by the TOKYO 18 criteria to classify cholecystitis and the PARKLAND criteria for technical difficulty and risks of post-operative complications, such as the case of cholecystocutaneous fistulas and increased morbidity and mortality. 3- In cases of subacute cholecystitis or empyema, Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Cholangio is the best pre-surgical study to define the bile ducts. 4- In cases of uncertainty about the conditions of the bile duct due to previous studies, intraoperative cholangiography is a very good option. 5- Make a differential diagnosis with large stones abandoned by laparoscopic or open surgery, whose clinical presentation is similar.	
Minor REVISION comments	Biliary-digestive diversions should be motivated when the common bile duct is larger than 2.5 cm.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alfonso Palmieri Luna
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Cartagena, Colombia