

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_107280
Title of the Manuscript:	A retrospective analysis of Paraduodenal Internal Hernia: A Case Series of Nine Patients
Type of the Article	Case study

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The reported case is unusual and therefore of great interest to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is appropriate to the story described.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is well described and quite comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the article is adequate.</p> <p>5. In the Introduction, the authors inform that "The gold standard for diagnosing Paraduodenal hernias is a CT abdomen scan." In relation to this exam, it is important to highlight the importance of oral contrast to aid in diagnosis. The contrast examination makes it possible to delimit the portion of the intestine involved, in addition to helping in cases that are not very symptomatic, making the diagnosis early. Of the reported cases, was any examination performed using contrast? How important was contrast in the diagnosis? This information must be described.</p> <p>The discussion is poor. In this section, the authors present data from the literature and provide a poor discussion of the data observed in the cases presented. Debate about the use of antibiotics, the need for a protective ostomy, the ideal time to return to the oral diet, among others, could be addressed. It is also important to discuss here the most appropriate approach: laparotomy or laparoscopy. In the data presented, we observed that in the two cases where the diagnosis was made early, it was possible to perform a laparoscopic approach. What parameters should be observed to decide how to approach?</p> <p>6. Although an article of this profile generally presents old references (due to the historical references of the disease), half of the references used are less than five years old, providing more recent information on diagnosis and treatment. Reference number 4 is incomplete and has different standardization than the others. Insert the year of publication, volume and pages of the article, in addition to adapting the name of the authors in the same format as the other references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language used in the article is appropriate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The case reports are very well described, concise but comprehensive. The discussion could better discuss the clinical data observed and the treatments performed in comparison to the most recent approaches observed in the literature.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> The authors present some images obtained during the patient's surgery. Is there no need to obtain the " Free and Informed Consent Form " to publish these images? Was this study submitted to a research ethics committee?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rafael Calvão Barbuto
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil