

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJCRS_126085 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Transverse Abdominis Release as an Effective Technique for Large Ventral Hernias: A Report of 13 Cases. |
| Type of the Article | Case report |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | It represents a good option with successful outcome for a common surgical problem. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes the abstract is comprehensive and is a good summary of the description ahead. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Author has described the technique of TAR well and also enumerated its benefits well. The TAR procedure comes with its benefits where mesh repair does not work. Not all cases of large ventral hernias can be repaired successfully with mesh. TAR remains a good alternative outcome with successful outcomes for the patient. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes | |
| Optional/General comments | Would be good if author is able to provide how the Tanaka index is calculated. Are the measurements obtained from CT imaging? | |

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Ranjita Pallavi |
| Department, University & Country | New York Medical College-Metropolitan Hospital Center, USA |