

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJMPCR_112904</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Hemothorax due to transdiaphragmatic liver penetrating injury caused by broken knife.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>The significance of this case study is in its ability to provide valuable insights for the scientific community on the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of such injuries, which are few and have the potential to be life-threatening. Gaining insight into the causes and treatment of such events may enhance patient outcomes and contribute to the wider knowledge base of trauma medicine.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The summary succinctly summarizes the main aspects of the paper, including the case, the management strategy, and the important lessons that may be applied to similar circumstances. The article's abstract is thorough and enlightening. The document offers a concise summary of the study's objectives, methodologies, results, and conclusions, effectively summarizing the main aspects of the paper.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. The English is well written and meets the scientific criteria and standard.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Felipe Damerou Ouriques</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Univeristy of Alabama at Birmingham, United States</b>