

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medecine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_127597
Title of the Manuscript:	Colonic Volvulus: An Update on Management- Narrative review article
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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)
<b>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.</b>	<i>The manuscript is interesting and significant for the scientific community as it addresses a rare but noteworthy pathology encountered in emergency surgery. This review is valuable for all surgeons and adds new insights on this topic, particularly considering the extended time frame it covers. It can contribute to deepening existing knowledge and developing future solutions. I believe the study is important, given its relevance to further research.</i>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<i>It is OK</i>	
<b>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.</b>	<i>Taking into account that the article will be published open access, I believe that the more than 50 words in the summary are sufficient.</i>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<i>It is OK</i>	
<b>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.</b>	<i>The manuscript is a review and presents a diagnostic and therapeutic approach at a given moment for a relatively uncommon pathology, compiling the opinions and approaches of numerous specialists and experts in the field. This leads to a well-founded conclusion that can be useful to other practitioners. What I believe should be added, and would be beneficial, are characteristic radiological, CT, MRI, and colonoscopic images, if available.</i>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<i>Yes</i>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><i>The language and the style is clear and concise.</i></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Relevance and Originality of the Research:</b>  <i>I evaluated the relevance of the topic and the originality of the research. The chosen subject, COLONIC VOLVULUS: An Update on Management - Narrative Review Article, addresses a condition with relatively low incidence. The manuscript pertains to an important pathology in the field, contributing to a better understanding of the subject and providing a useful update for any professional in the domain.</i></p> <p><b>Methodology:</b>  <i>The methodology employed is clear and well-justified, based on a retrospective analysis through literature review using PUBMED, the Cochrane database for clinical reviews, and Google Scholar. It includes clinical trials, observational studies, cohort studies, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses spanning from 1980 to 2024. This timeline is impressive, but it would be interesting to include the total number of patients analyzed by combining data from all sources.</i></p> <p><b>Results and Interpretation:</b>  <i>The results are presented clearly and logically in the table within the article, and their interpretation is well-founded on the obtained data. However, considering the bibliography includes 59 references, I believe the table should cover more studies. Additionally, it would be beneficial and appropriate to include characteristic radiological, CT, MRI, or colonoscopic images, if available.</i></p> <p><b>Structure and Clarity:</b>  <i>The manuscript is well-structured and easy to follow.</i></p> <p><b>References and Citations:</b>  <i>The authors have cited 59 relevant works in the field, ranging from the 1980s to the present, most of which are recent and sufficient in number.</i></p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b>  <i>The manuscript meets most of the criteria and does not require significant changes. A high score (9-10) can be assigned. It can be classified as "Accepted as is" or adjusted by incorporating the recommended images, if available.</i></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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Liviu Dubei</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania</b></p>