

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_118310
Title of the Manuscript:	Intracolonic migration of an abdominal drain as a complication of a fecal fistula managed conservatively
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://www.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-policy>)

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 due to its rarity and successful non surgical management offers insights for situations. It presents an approach that could be useful for clinicians facing challenges.</p> <p>2. It effectively highlights the main aspects of the case; the complication (intracolonic migration) context (abdominal drain and fecal fistula) and management strategy (conservative).</p> <p>3. The abstract succinctly summarizes the cases points covering the complication, treatment approach and outcome. While it provides an overview of the case mentioning the patients presentation and condition leading to the complication could enhance its completeness.</p> <p>4. The manuscripts structure is well organized with sections such, as introduction, case presentation, discussion and conclusion.</p> <p>5. The document seems to be scientifically accurate. It presents the case with specifics, diagnostic results and treatment plans. The utilization of imaging to verify the location of the drain and the cautious approach to handling the complication are well documented and supported.</p> <p>6. The sources referenced in the document are pertinent and up to date bolstering the dialogue and conclusions made. Nonetheless including sources on managing fistulas and employing conservative methods, in similar scenarios could enhance and enrich the discourse further.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes however there is only two error marked</p> <p>1- High fistula output</p> <p>2- CT not x-ray in the Fig.1</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript makes an addition to the existing research on complications following appendectomy and the strategies for treatment. By refining the abstract and discussion and including a more references it will offer deeper insights for healthcare professionals and researchers in this area.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohannad Eledreesi
Department, University & Country	Taif Armed Forces Hospitals, Saudi Arabia