

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_125588
Title of the Manuscript:	From Tubal Ligation to Inguinal Hernia Surprise: Unexpected Complication of Tubal Ligation - A Rare Case
Type of the Article	Case study

#### **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**

<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)
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 is of great importance for clinical practice, because it is a rare finding of an ovary in a hernia sac.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Surprising Consequences of Tubal Ligation: A Rare Case of Inguinal Hernia	
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.	The summary is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are responsive.	
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.	It is of exceptional importance. It shows a rare case in clinical practice, necessary to draw the attention of clinicians.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is necessary to supplement the references, so that they are not older than 5 years, in accordance with the expansion of the discussion.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	It is suitable.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Introduction: It is necessary to write more details in the introduction regarding this case. A meager introduction. Expand.</p> <p>Case presentation: State which fallopian tube was ligated 5 years ago.</p> <p>Clinical findings: The beginning of the paragraph is confusingly described. Clarify in more detail.</p> <p>Explain what you did with the ovary that was in the hernial sac.</p> <p>Discussion: The beginning of the discussion is duplicated. You state the same/similar sentence in the introduction. Expand the discussion with more relevant references. List the advantages and disadvantages of this study.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mladen Kasalovic</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Serbia</b>