

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_126227
Title of the Manuscript:	Strangulated transepiploic hernia: A rare case and review of the literature
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Thank you for the good taste of your magazine for choosing this aspect for judging this article, I am happy that the author has shared her scientific experience for the use of the field of surgery and has taken steps to improve knowledge in this field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is better to write the title structurally in this way: Strangulated trans epiploic hernia: A rare case and review of the literature	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Please review the writing and sentence structure of the article; the text has many problems with the principles of English writing.	
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 above text has a correct scientific basis and is one of the frequently discussed and challenging cases in surgical science.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References from published articles are ancient, and it is better to add references from recent years when references are not in standard format.	
Minor REVISION comments	No, it needs careful revision.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Focus more on the structure of literature and text writing and improving the topic in terms of referencing newer studies.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hossein Hemmati
Department, University & Country	Guilan University of Medical Sciences, Islamic Republic of Iran