

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_99292
Title of the Manuscript:	Inverted Meckel's Diverticulum and literature review – 3 Case Reports
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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>We consider that it is of importance for the medical scientific community, since it reveals aspects of interest in the pathologies described.</p> <p>Yeah that's right.</p> <p>It is explanatory and complies with the rules of its structure, just point out to reduce the keywords. 4 or at most 5 are considered correct.</p> <p>To be a case study it is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, I consider it, although the considerations indicated in the text must be rectified. Example of the order of the citations in the text, as well as other details.</p> <p>The author did a thorough review of the literature, but made only 5 citations. He must rectify the omission of quotes and noted bibliographies that do not appear in the text. The author must correct these details to improve his presentation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>In the case of language, only expressive details that should not appear in research papers. See revised text..</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I consider that the work is correct and that the points that are exposed in the comments of the revised work should be corrected.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luis Remedios Hernández
Department, University & Country	Cuba