

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_96408
Title of the Manuscript:	Intestinal Obstruction Caused by Small Bowel Volvulus
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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/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. It is an ordinary manuscript with nothing significant to report. The Case Report is quite abridged and is lacking many important details. There are no details regarding the clinical presentation of the patient in the preoperative period. No patient related history is mentioned. The intraoperative details are not mentioned. The patient's blood investigations are not mentioned. In case they were insignificant, a single sentence stating that 'the investigations were within normal limits' or any similar sentence may be used. There are no comments regarding the type and steps of surgical procedure. The type of anaesthesia used and anaesthetic complications/challenges are not mentioned. There is no information regarding the postoperative stay of the patient in the hospital or his condition on follow-ups. 2. The title of the manuscript seems appropriate. 3. The abstract is comprehensive. 4. The manuscript is appropriately structured. 5. The manuscript seems to be scientifically sound. 6. The references are sufficient and fairly recent. But they are not following a uniform referencing style.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article needs revision. There are multiple grammatical mistakes.	
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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Devang Bharti
Department, University & Country	Cantonment General Hospital, India