

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_120553
Title of the Manuscript:	"A case report on an ingested mobile phone in stomach: endoscopic retrieval a better choice or surgery"
Type of the Article	Case report

General guideline for 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 guideline for 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>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This case report contributes to the limited body of knowledge on a rare and potentially hazardous condition - mobile phone ingestion. - By documenting the challenges encountered during both endoscopic and surgical retrieval, the authors highlight the complexities involved in managing such cases. This information is valuable for clinicians encountering similar situations, as it provides insights into potential management strategies and potential complications. - However, the manuscript's impact could be enhanced by a more detailed discussion of the decision-making process behind the choice of endoscopic versus surgical intervention. A deeper exploration of the factors influencing this choice, along with a comparative analysis of the risks and benefits of each approach, would strengthen the manuscript's clinical relevance. Additionally, a more comprehensive literature review on foreign body ingestion, including different types of ingested objects and their management, would broaden the manuscript's scope and appeal to a wider audience. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "A case report on an ingested mobile phone in stomach: endoscopic retrieval a better choice or surgery" is generally suitable. It clearly and concisely conveys the main focus of the case report.</p> <p>Potential Alternative Titles While the current title is effective, here are a few alternative options for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More concise: "Mobile Phone Ingestion: Endoscopic vs. Surgical Retrieval" • Highlighting challenge: "Challenges in Retrieving an Ingested Mobile Phone" • Focusing on outcome: "Successful Retrieval of Ingested Mobile Phone: A Case Report" 	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract is generally informative but could be improved by providing more specific details and highlighting the key findings. <p>Suggestions for Improvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantify the patient's age: Instead of "A 25-year-old prisoner," consider using "A 25-year-old male prisoner." 2. Specify the type of pain: Clearly describe the patient's abdominal pain (e.g., location, severity, duration). 3. Elaborate on the endoscopic challenges: Provide more details about the specific difficulties encountered during endoscopy (e.g., size of the mobile phone, shape, or orientation). 4. Highlight the key finding: Emphasize the primary conclusion of the case report, such as "Endoscopic retrieval of large foreign bodies, like mobile phones, may be challenging and may require surgical intervention." 5. Consider adding patient outcomes: Briefly mention the patient's postoperative course and any complications. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The structure of the manuscript generally follows the standard format for a case report - While the overall structure is appropriate, there are some areas where the manuscript could be strengthened: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Presentation: Consider adding subsections to improve clarity and readability. For example, you could divide the "Presentation of case" section into subsections such as "Patient history," "Clinical examination," "Investigations," and "Management." • Discussion: Expand the discussion section to include a more comprehensive literature review on mobile phone ingestion and compare the management strategies used in this case to those reported in the literature. 	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limitations: Add a brief section discussing the limitations of the case report, such as the small sample size and the lack of a control group. <p>By incorporating these suggestions, the manuscript will have a clearer and more organized structure, enhancing its readability and overall quality.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript presents a scientifically accurate and technically sound case report on a rare occurrence of mobile phone ingestion. The authors have accurately described the patient's presentation, diagnostic procedures, and management strategies. The case is well-documented with relevant clinical details and supported by appropriate imaging studies. The discussion section provides a clear overview of the challenges associated with managing such cases and highlights the limitations of endoscopic retrieval for large foreign bodies. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	yes	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The text is generally clear, concise, and grammatically correct. However, there are a few areas where minor improvements could be made, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Word choice: Some words or phrases could be replaced with more precise or academic terms. Sentence structure: Occasionally, sentences might be restructured for better clarity or flow. Consistency: Maintaining consistent terminology throughout the article is essential. <p>Overall, the language used is appropriate for the target audience and does not hinder the understanding of the content.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The case report provides a valuable contribution to the literature on a rare and challenging clinical scenario. The authors have adequately described the case and its management.</p> <p>Key strengths of the manuscript include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and concise presentation of the case. Appropriate use of medical terminology. Relevant discussion of the challenges encountered. 	

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:	Abeer Shaker Elmoursy Ali
Department, University & Country	Umm Al Qurra University, Saudi Arabia