

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_96677
Title of the Manuscript:	Migrating Intrauterine Device Mimicking an Acute Appendicitis: a Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The clinical picture did not simulate acute appendicitis at all. The patient had elevated acute phase reactants and leukocytes/neutrophils and a pathologic abdominal examination, but imaging studies did not show any appendiceal abnormalities at any time. CT clearly showed a foreign body, so that to orient the case as an "appendicitis simulator" is erroneous, to say the least. 2. The Introduction is extremely brief. What is the relevance of the worldwide distribution of contraceptive methods? Authors should focus on the setting in which they are working. The introduction should be a text directed to the problem or case to be addressed, in this case IUD migration. 3. The clinical case approach is inadequate. There is no discussion of the patient's history. No one took a medical history before ordering a CT scan? No CT or surgical images are included. And the subsequent follow-up? 4. To talk about surgical success rates in a pathology with such a low prevalence does not seem adequate to me. 5. Bibliographic references are misspelled, with words merged in many cases. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The manuscript needs extensive revision of the English and scientific language used. Verb tenses are disjointed and there are inadequate terms. There are unconnected and meaningless sentences. Some examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "it has proved as effective safe and widely used" > "it has been shown to be a contraceptive method with a high efficacy rate and an adequate margin of safety." • "Among the rare but serious complication" > ""Among the infrequent but potentially serious complications"" • "right iliac región" > "right iliac fossa" • "acutely ill-appearing patient with defense" > "The patient's general condition was impaired. On physical examination she had abdominal guarding" • "The patient goes well and he was discharged 2 days after." • "The patient disclosed that she had received an insertion of an IUD 23 years.". 23 years ago? Before? • "under general" Anesthesia? 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Javier Arredondo Montero
Department, University & Country	University of Navarra, Spain