

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_97617
Title of the Manuscript:	Small bowel obstruction by a Primary flange on mesenteric ganglionic tuberculosis : A case report
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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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 a 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>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. No</p> <p>- Abstract: It does not fit the parameters of a good abstract. The author(s) should remember that the abstract should generally state the main aspects of the manuscript. I recommend reviewing the CARE guidelines for case reports.</p> <p>A good summary should incorporate the following:</p> <p>a. Background information to contextualise the study</p> <p>b. The research aims.</p> <p>c. Main findings (in case of a case report, it should address the most critical aspects of the case presented).</p> <p>b. Address the conclusions.</p> <p>4. No</p> <p>- Introduction:</p> <p>The introduction is extremely brief. The author(s) should remember that a good introduction should provide sufficient background to contextualise the research and give readers a good understanding of the manuscript. It should clarify what is already known about the topic in question through a proper literature review. I recommend reviewing the CARE guidelines for case reports.</p> <p>5. No</p> <p>6. No</p> <p>- References</p> <p>94% of the references date from before 2013, i.e., over a decade old. In addition, some of them have been misreferenced, and the authors should review this aspect.</p> <p>7. Quotations</p> <p>- The placement of quotation numbers has many errors; for example, in the introduction, the quotations [17] and [18] are placed after the source [1]. I think the author(s) should revise the aspect thoroughly.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No</p> <p>There are many punctuation, grammatical and spelling errors.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Orlando Téllez Almenares
Department, University & Country	University of Medical Sciences of Santiago de Cuba, Cuba