

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_127202
Title of the Manuscript:	Gastric volvulus: a rare cause of acute abdomen in a 84 year old patient- a case report
Type of the Article	Case report

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The authors discuss a condition that, although rare, can lead to an acute abdominal presentation with a high mortality rate. Additionally, the patient in question is 84 years old, which further emphasizes the significance of this condition as highlighted by the authors. The goal here is to raise awareness about this rare condition and underscore the importance of early diagnosis and intervention to reduce mortality rates. However, the importance of the topic would be better conveyed if the authors provided more detailed information in the introduction and discussion sections. This would enhance the impact on the reader and strengthen the overall message.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is describing the importance of that case briefly that is why it suitable for the article.	
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.	I believe that the smoking history is unnecessary information in the case presentation, as it does not appear to be a relevant risk factor for this condition. The discussion section of the abstract could place more emphasis on the morbidity and mortality associated with gastric volvulus.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The Introduction is quite brief; it mentions the definition of the disease and its rarity, but it would be helpful to include additional details such as the incidence rates, definitions of primary and secondary forms, causes of secondary volvulus, the idiopathic nature of primary volvulus and its incidence, as well as distinctions between acute and chronic forms. A brief overview of the general clinical presentation, differential diagnoses, diagnostic algorithm, and treatment options would help the reader gain a clearer and more comprehensive understanding of the topic. Finally, in the Case Presentation, instead of describing it as a "gastric volvulus without having a predisposing diaphragmatic anatomic abnormality." it would be more accurate to state that it is an idiopathic primary volvulus. This would provide a more precise introduction to the case. In the Presentation of the Case the age, gender, and surgical history are well described; however, if smoking history is included, chronic comorbidities should also be mentioned, as smoking is not a direct risk factor for this condition. Instead, the focus should be on the risk factors that could potentially contribute to the development of this condition. After providing general information about the condition in the Introduction, incorporating these details in the Case Presentation would help the reader better understand and visualize the context. In the laparoscopic observation, it would be helpful to provide more details about whether areas of necrosis due to torsion were observed, including information about the color and perfusion of the tissue. Additionally, it could be stated more clearly that no anatomical abnormalities contributing to the volvulus were identified. Was a follow-up conducted, and if so, was any further imaging performed? If imaging was done, relevant details could be provided. In the Discussion, the information related to symptoms, diagnosis, and treatment is presented in a logical flow. However, it would be beneficial to compare the case with other reported cases from the literature, particularly those with differences in age or gender, and highlight any distinguishing features. Currently, the literature is not referenced. Additionally, more compelling, literature-supported information could be provided regarding morbidity and mortality associated with the condition. In the	

Review Form 3

	<p>follow-up section, a brief mention of potential complications that need to be monitored would also be valuable. Moreover, it could be useful to explore whether there are any reported cases in the literature where the diagnosis was delayed, and if such delays led to complications. This comparison could provide valuable insights into the importance of early diagnosis and intervention.</p> <p>"Gastric volvulus is a rare abdominal emergency requiring a prompt diagnosis and expeditious surgical treatment," is a well-stated point. However, the information regarding "it most commonly results from a diaphragm defect or other intra-abdominal abnormalities which should be addressed during the same surgery to prevent a recurrence" is not relevant to this case and should be excluded. Instead, it should be emphasized that in patients presenting with these symptoms, regardless of age, gastric volvulus should be considered in the differential diagnosis.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The necessary structural adjustments have been detailed thoroughly. Given that this is certainly an important issue, I believe that with the required revisions, this could make a valuable contribution to the literature.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Albloushi D, Quttaineh D, Alsafran S, et al. Acute gastric volvulus: A rare case report and literature review. <i>Ann Med Surg (Lond)</i>. 2021;70:102857. Published 2021 Sep 13. doi:10.1016/j.amsu.2021.102857</p> <p>The references could be more from recent years, and it would be helpful to mention some key characteristics of cases from the literature. I have provided an example for reference.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The visuals were quite good and relevant.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fatma Basak Tanoglu
Department, University & Country	Acibadem Taksim Hospital, Turkey