

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_99803
Title of the Manuscript:	Axial torsion of a Giant Meckel's Diverticulum Causing small bowel obstruction: A case report and Review of the literature
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)
Compulsory REVISION 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Average 2. Acceptable 3. Yes, although it needs a language revision 4. No 5. Its poor, it needs a major revision 6. Yes <p>The introduction is more a brief historical review than a text aimed at presenting the specific problem. "Patient was admitted at Jatal hospital and research Centre in the year 2002" Authors should understand that academic journals follow a blinded peer review system and that putting data from the center which allows identification merits immediate disqualification from the review process. The authors use abbreviations in the figure that they have not previously clarified in the text. 520 degrees of rotation means 1.44 complete rotations. This is an extremely precise and in my opinion surgically impossible to calculate. After presenting the clinical case, and without specifying the beginning of the discussion, the authors continue giving data that do not correspond to the article, such as the embryology of the diverticulum.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Text needs major language revision (e.g.: A Meckel's Diverticulum are classified, emergency explorative laparotomy).	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Javier Arredondo Montero
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Navarra, Spain