

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_121031
Title of the Manuscript:	Sclectosing Encapsulating Peritonitis and Meckel's Diverticulum in a patient with Small Bowel Obstruction
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is an interesting case which is encountered very rarely. In Indian scenario, small bowel obstruction is often attributed to tuberculosis. The importance of such case reports lies in the correct diagnosis and adequate treatment of the patient.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Primary Sclerosing Encapsulating Peritonitis (Type I) with incidental Meckel's diverticulum as a cause of small bowel obstruction: A rare entity	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No. The abstract should be adequately informative and preferably well structured under subheadings present in the case report. Please mention the details of patient, intervention and outcomes in brief.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of article is appropriate. However, the content in the introduction and discussion section is less. The incidence of the disease is not mentioned to show its rarity. The suggested etiopathogenesis of the disease is not mentioned (any genetic predisposition). The differential diagnoses of the disease are numerous and only few have been elaborated in the discussion. Long term follow-up as per literature and recurrence is not mentioned in the manuscript. The various methods of preventing the recurrence and their outcomes is not mentioned.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript prepared is technically sound. The manuscript has been formulated in well descriptive manner. The difficulty in identifying such cases preoperatively makes this article very important.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some grammatical and punctuation errors. Kindly rectify them.	
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 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nikhil Tayal
Department, University & Country	Positron Multispeciality Hospital, India