

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_111072
Title of the Manuscript:	Left paraduodenal hernia: rare cause of acute intestinal obstruction
Type of the Article	Case report

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This case report presents an important clinical case of a rare type of internal hernia causing bowel obstruction. It highlights key features in diagnosis and management which are valuable lessons for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title "Left paraduodenal hernia: rare cause of acute intestinal obstruction" is suitable and captures the key message of the case report.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract provides a concise yet comprehensive summary of the key details of this case report.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure with sections on Introduction, Case Report, Discussion and Conclusion is appropriate and covers the key aspects expected in a case report. The subsections within these are also logically organized.</p> <p>5. From my assessment, the clinical and radiological details presented seem scientifically sound, and the management is as per established guidelines for this condition. So yes, I believe the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references seem appropriate and include recent as well as seminal papers on this topic. No additional references seem necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The authors could elaborate a bit more on the surgical technique used for defect repair rather than just mentioning the two approaches. More operative details are welcome in case reports. The Conclusion effectively summarizes the key take-aways, but could be made more impactful by emphasizing the learning points of early radiological diagnosis and prompt surgery given morbidity rates. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, concise, and uses appropriate academic terminology and style. There are no obvious grammatical or vocabulary issues that would hinder comprehension or quality. Technical terms are well-explained, and the flow of information is logical. Overall, the language use meets the standards expected for a scholarly case report that could be published in an academic journal.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Savvas Lampridis
Department, University & Country	Hammersmith Hospital, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, UK