

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_99077
Title of the Manuscript:	Incarcerated bladder hernia as a cause of septic shock: A clinical case report
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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. 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)	1. Yes, especially important in cases with urinary symptoms with abnormal appearance and examination for hernia sac containing incarcerated bladder 2. Yes, enough. 3. Yes, it is. But; The following two sentences should be written more clearly: "We present the case of a 61-year-old male who presented with septic shock, of urinary origin and renal failure, an abdominopelvic tomography was performed which showed the presence of an inguinoscrotal hernia on the left side in whose sac is visible more than 50% of the urinary bladder, as well as the left ureter, with the presence of significant dilation of the ipsilateral pyelocalyceal system. Reason for adding management of general surgery and urology departments." 4 and 5. Appopirate. But, in the discussion section, the author did not make an analogy or comparison between the cases in the literature and his patient. 6.Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Sentence structures should be reviewed and grammatically written throughout the article. Punctuation marks have been used inappropriately and should be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	Minor revision: The article can be published after the above corrections are made.	

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:	Mustafa Yaşar Özdamar
Department, University & Country	Erzincan University, Turkey