

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_102194
Title of the Manuscript:	Giant Meckel's Diverticulum Causing Small bowel obstruction – 5 Case Reports
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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The manuscript is important to scientific community as clinician and pathologist since Meckel's Diverticulum size more than 5 cm are classified as Giant Meckel's Diverticulum and they are relatively rare and may be more prone complications.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title need to be revised to case series</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract need revision and to be more informative</b></li> <li>4. <b>subsections and structure of the manuscript were inappropriate, the authors should follow the criteria of writing a case report or case series</b></li> <li>5. <b>manuscript is scientifically correct BUT major revision is required</b></li> <li>6. <b>Up to date references should be added to reference list.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Design of the study should be clarified</li> <li>2. More details about case presentation should be mentioned for each case</li> <li>3. More details about discussion should be incorporated within text for each case presented</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tahrir N. Aldelaimi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Anbar, Iraq</b>