

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_99040
Title of the Manuscript:	Fronto-orbital cranio-encephalic foreign body secondary to an unusual accident at work
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> )

### 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> <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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>no</p> <p>yes</p> <p>no</p> <p>no</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	no	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Although the case is very interesting, the manuscript is not well-written one. Also, the authors have no CT angiography or DSA and no picture revealing intraoperative events. The abstract is explaining about fronto-occipital injury? The case has not been well presented. Discussion is not enough.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ahmad Pour Rashidi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>