

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Surgery</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	As internal hernias are rare it is good documentation of a rare case leading to intestinal obstruction	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title can be more precise – there is no need to mention about review in title	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The management details also to be provided method of reduction etc to be given in detail	
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 is very scientific as it is presenting a strangulated trans epiploic hernia case	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes they seems to be adequately written	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Language is proper .. there seems to be no grammatical mistakes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>KM Sweta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>RGUHS, India</b>