

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_98922
Title of the Manuscript:	Liver's herniation through Lumbar incisional hernia : two cases 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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	It is important despite its rarity  yes  yes but to be slightly linguistically amended  yes  yes  references are good but in 2 of them the year is not in accordance with the others	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes after some amendment . I outlined the areas to be changed omitted or rephrased with red color	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In the discussion sector it would be better if there was some explanation for why choosing the midline approach rather than other anterior approaches or posterior approach	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maytham H. Al-Qanbar
Department, University & Country	University of Kufa, University of Al-Ameed, Iraq