

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_99776
Title of the Manuscript:	SLIDING INGUINAL HERNIA IN ELDERLY PATIENT CONTAINING OVARY AND FALLOPIAN TUBE : 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>can be updated more.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>TITLE The title gave a good indication of the work presented.</p> <p>ABSTRACT The abstract was a comprehensive summary of the study, which included all the key points.</p> <p>KEYWORDS Relevant keywords were included. Please add transabdominal pre-peritoneal (TAPP)</p> <p>INTRODUCTION The introduction was clear, well-organised, and 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 very good review of the literature, with appropriate citations. It also included the author's reflection on their results as well as the limitations of the study.</p> <p>CONCLUSION The Conclusion is extremely short and a bit generic, not reflecting your results; please reflect on your work. Also, advising prospective studies to develop more robust data is always good practice.</p> <p>REFERENCES The reference citation was appropriate, accurate, and in the correct order, but can be updated more.</p> <p>FIGURES The figures were clear, informative, of good quality and properly cited in the text. Please remove the date and time on the second figure. The figure's legends need to be more descriptive.</p> <p>FINAL IMPRESSION The authors identified a relatively rare case and presented a thorough, informative</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>literature search.</p> <p>The manuscript was well written, with appropriate structure, and the evidence presented was sound, but the conclusion need to be written.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the whole manuscript requires significant language editing to make it more appealing to readers.</p> <p>I would consider reviewing it after revision.</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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 NHS Trust, United Kingdom