

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_103518
Title of the Manuscript:	BILATERAL OBSTRUCTED INGUINAL HERNIA WITH AMYAND'S HERNIA : A RARE 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.journalijmPCR.com/index.php/IJMPCR/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Suggest: Bilateral obstructed inguinal hernia with left sided Amyand hernia.</p> <p>Last sentence of the first paragraph of introduction not understood.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Why two separate inguinal incisions were joined in the midline as mentioned in the case report. What was the advantage/benefit?</p> <p>Caecum and appendix can not be appreciated in the clinical photographs. Clinical photographs should be clear and representative of the case, it should clearly be marked showing the relevant structures.</p> <p>Small bowel appears to be dusky and not frankly gangrenous. Why was a resection of the bowel done?</p> <p>Can not differentiate which photograph is for which side.</p> <p>It should be clearly mentioned whether it was small or large bowel that was involved.</p> <p>Discussion is inadequate. Author should have also discussed relevant cases reported in the world literature also. What could have been the possible reason for the left sided Amyand hernia?</p> <p>Yes</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>Could have been better.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Subhajeet Dey
Department, University & Country	Sikkim Manipal University, Sikkim Manipal Institute of Medical Sciences, India