

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Surgery</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRS_118310</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Intracolonic migration of an abdominal drain as a complication of a fecal fistula managed conservatively</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case Report</b>

### **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://www.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>1-</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Case Details and Management:</b> By detailing a specific case, including patient presentation, diagnosis, treatment, and outcomes, the manuscript provides valuable insights into the conservative management of such rare complications. This information can guide clinicians in handling similar situations, potentially reducing the need for more invasive surgical interventions.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Conservative Management Approach:</b> The manuscript highlights a less invasive therapeutic approach that led to good results. This approach, involving clamping the drain, monitoring, and eventually allowing the drain to be expelled naturally, could be a valuable reference for managing other cases with similar complications, emphasizing the feasibility of conservative management.</p> <p>2- Based on the content provided, the title of the article should clearly reflect the unique and significant aspects of the case study. A suitable title would emphasize the rarity of the complication, the conservative management approach, and the specific medical context (i.e., post-appendectomy).</p> <p>A possible title could be:</p> <p>"Intracolonic Migration of an Abdominal Drain Through an Appendiceal Fistula: A Rare Post-Appendectomy Complication Managed Conservatively"</p> <p>3- Based on the provided information, the abstract of the article appears to be quite comprehensive. It covers the key elements necessary for an abstract in a medical case report, including the background, objective, case presentation, and conclusions</p> <p>4- Based on the information provided, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate for a medical case report.</p> <p><b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b></p> <p>5- <b>Figures and Tables:</b> Including relevant images (e.g., CT scans showing the drain's position) and tables summarizing lab results can enhance understanding.</p> <p><b>Detailed Management Protocols:</b> Providing a more detailed protocol for the conservative management approach used in this case can be helpful for other clinicians.</p> <p><b>Patient Consent and Ethical Considerations:</b> Ensure that patient consent for publication is obtained and mentioned in the manuscript.</p> <p>Based on the provided information, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. Here's an analysis of key aspects to determine its scientific accuracy:</p> <p><b>Case Presentation and Management</b></p> <p><b>Detailed Clinical Information:</b></p> <p>a. The manuscript provides a comprehensive description of the patient's history, symptoms, diagnostic findings, and treatment, which is essential for scientific</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>accuracy.</p> <p><b>Diagnostic Tools:</b></p> <p>b. The use of ultrasound and CT scans for diagnosis and follow-up is appropriate and standard practice in medical science.</p> <p><b>Management Approach:</b></p> <p>c. The conservative management approach, including antibiotic therapy, laparoscopic drainage, and monitoring of the drain, is described in detail and aligns with accepted medical practices.</p> <p>d. The novel approach of managing intracolonic migration of the drain conservatively, considering the patient's stability and lack of symptoms, is scientifically justified and well-rationalized.</p> <p>6- The existing references are not recent. There are gaps in the literature review; consider adding the types of references suggested above. This will strengthen the manuscript's foundation and provide a thorough context for the case presented.</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>The manuscript's language and English quality are largely suitable for scholarly communication, but there is room for refinement. Attention to grammar, punctuation, clarity, and consistency will enhance readability and ensure that the manuscript meets the high standards expected in scientific literature</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b> Consider revising the title for clarity and specificity, providing more detailed information on the patient's clinical course and management approach, ensuring consistency in formatting, addressing grammatical errors, and including statements on ethical approval and competing interests.</p>	

**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)
<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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mehrnaz Mostafavi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shahid Beheshti Medical University, Iran</b>