

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_98129
Title of the Manuscript:	An Acute strangulated Inguinal hernia in an elderly female – A 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.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Not really</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>TITLE The title gave a good indication of the work presented.</p> <p>ABSTRACT The abstract is too short and needs to be expanded to be a good summary of the work presented. I would suggest dividing it into sections (background, aim, case presented and conclusion).</p> <p>KEYWORDS Relevant keywords were included.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION The introduction was not only practical, clear, and well-organised, but also gave a good background to the presented work.</p> <p>CASE PRESENTATION The case was very well presented with the correct sequence of events and included all the required relevant information.</p> <p>DISCUSSION The discussion was a good review of the literature, with appropriate citations. It also included the author's reflection on their case.</p> <p>CONCLUSION A well-written conclusion that reflected the findings studied and their implication on clinical practice. It will also be helpful to recommend a larger study to come up with more robust data.</p> <p>REFERENCES The reference citation was appropriate, accurate, and in the correct order.</p> <p>FIGURES The figures were clear, informative, of good quality and properly cited in the text. Figure 6 is not needed as it does not add much to the case. Figure 7 needs to be removed as it shows the patients' identity.</p> <p>FINAL IMPRESSION The authors identified a relatively rare case and presented a thorough, informative literature search.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	The manuscript was well written, with appropriate structure, the evidence presented was sound, and the conclusion was in line with the evidence presented. Unfortunately, the whole manuscript requires significant language editing to make it more appealing to readers. I would consider reviewing it after revision.	
--	---	--

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:	Sherif Monib
Department, University & Country	West Hertfordshire Teaching Hospitals, United Kingdom