

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_103761
Title of the Manuscript:	Sigmoid Volvulus-Current Management-Narrative review article
Type of the Article	Review Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>It is an article that reviews the scientific data on the treatment and management of sigmoid volvulus in the literature. It is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract could be a little more comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the article are appropriate.</p> <p>I think the article is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are adequate but could be more up-to-date in my opinion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/English quality of the article is appropriate for scientific communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The fact that all of the studies mentioned in the table in the review were retrospective and the number of patients in some of them was relatively low is, in my opinion, a limitation of the study. Also, in my opinion, there is no need to emphasize methods such as barium radiography, which are not applicable in current practice. The tables and graphs of the study could be better designed.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alp Ömer Cantürk
Department, University & Country	Sakarya University Education and Research Hospital, Turkey