

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</a>
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**

<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)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The case is original and had few in the literature. The case is well illustrated. It shows a case that had use two methodologies.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>Yes, I suggest correcting the discussion phase beginning (is not in capital letters)</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The article analyzes how to remove an unusual and large foreign body. I suggest removing the phrase "Patient was initially taken to nearby district hospital from where he was referred to our hospital for further management" from the case presentation in the text. Likewise, review the phrase "Post endoscopy, due to persistent pain abdomen, patient was posted for elective surgery.", as the surgery was performed to remove the device, regardless of the pain as it would not pass through the pylorus.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>Yes, but "Very few articles have been found regarding mobile phone ingestion, and majority articles preferred surgical removal as a better option." has no references cited. In references 1,2,3,4 are the same article, I suggest correction. I suggest citing the ESGE foreign body removal guideline.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, I suggest review the phrase: "The endoscopic procedure was very tedious and result were not very satisfactory"</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### Review Form 3

#### **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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Leticia Rosevics</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hospital de Clínicas da Universidade Federal do Paraná, Brazil</b>