

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.	This manuscript describes the newer technique TAR in repairing large ventral hernias	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title needs correction, its "Transversus Abdominis Release" not Transverse Abdominis Release	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Suggest to include subsection "Inclusion and Exclusion criteras"	
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.	The manuscript mentions the latest technique TAR for repair of large ventral hernias. The technique is anatomically and physiologically appropriate. Though some corrections and additional information needs to be included	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	As mentioned in title correction, its "Transversus Abdominis Release" In table 1, case 3; what does "Severe" intestinal perforation mean. It needs correction Case 5 may not fit in this study as posterior rectus sheath could not be approximated even after TAR In case 6, complication of wound dehiscence doesn't clarify was there wound infection. If so, whether mesh was removed? Case 12 mentions "Severe" mesenteric tear, needs correction Whether Pulmonary Function Tests were performed in all patients In Discussion subsection "However, recto rectus repair is limited in cases of severe ventral hernia with large defects due to the Linea semilunaris, making the installation of large mesh nearly impossible [8]." What does "Severe" ventral hernia mean, please define Please mention normal value of Tanaka Index "Recto rectus" needs to be corrected by "Retro rectus" in all places	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript can be accepted with above mentioned corrections	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sunilkumar Alur
Department, University & Country	Trustwell Hospitals, India