Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJCRS_97789**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ADULT COLOCOLIC INTUSUSSCEPTION SECONDARY TO LIPOMA – ENTEROTOMY OVER RESECTION – A DIFFERENT APPROACH**
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 1.7

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. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**We would like to congratulate the author for presenting the case report. Here we would like to advise some corrections in the manuscript, making the case report more representable and unique.** 1. **Yes** 2. **Acceptable** 3. **Acceptable abstract.** 4. **Discussion needs major changes and The conclusion must be concise rather than explanatory.** 5. **Acceptable after satisfactory answers and corrections from the Author.** 6. **A] References must be in sequence in the discussion section. B] Author enlisted 12 references, but references 5, 9, 10, and 11 were not found anywhere in the entire manuscript. C] Reference no 12 is mentioned in the discussion section but not in the reference list. D] Most references are older than 10 years. We advise the author should provide a more recent reference. E] Give more references.** 7. **Discussion section is very haphazard, and not informative, we advise it should be informative to readers. Not addressing the issue of what the author would like to convey. "NEED MAJOR CORRECTION AND REVISION "in the discussion section.** 8. **Conclusion must be concise and informative. Rather than an explanation.**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. It is advisable to use a complete word rather than a short form, like '1 h' use one hour or 1 hour. 2. Through Spelling and grammar check is needed. 3. Read manuscript guidelines on word limit, format, and reference style.	
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:	**Sachin Suryawanshi**
Department, University & Country	**Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, India**