

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_126381
Title of the Manuscript:	RADIOLOGICAL DIAGNOSIS OF A LEFT ISOMERISM HETEROTAXY ASSOCIATED TO AN ESOPHAGOGASTRIC MOTILITY DISORDER: ABOUT A CASE
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>

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 is a nice case report of a complex congenital anatomical anomaly in a 12-year-old girl. The authors nicely explain the defects with appropriate imagery. I do have problems with the adequate terminology and language, so I would suggest that the article is reviewed by a person with expertise in English radiological terminology. After minor revisions, I would recommend publishing this article due to interesting nature of the congenital anatomy which will contribute to the expert content and scientific community for further research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I would suggest changing "about a case" into "a case report".	
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 abstract is comprehensive. I would suggest correcting the typos in few words. The third paragraph needs a slight improvement. Suggestion: We report a particular case of left isomerism in aef a 12-year-old girl diagnosed by CT scan associating-associated with entire colon and complete common mesentery located on the lefta-complete common mesentery with the entire colon located on the left, the small intestine and the stomach distended up the iliac region transposed to the right, a midline liver with transposition of the abdominal vessels and gallbladder, and a polysplenia. These anomalies were associated with a megaesophagus probably linked to a motility ab normality.	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language should be improved. Example: The procedure-exam was performed with a General Electric optima 16-bar-row CT scan in a fasting patient, supine position and feet first. Three series of acquisitions were performed: 1. non-contrast and post-contrast in arterial phase scanning the region of thorax, abdomen and pelvis, and post-contrast in portovenous phase scanning abdomen and pelvis regions. one without then with injection of contrast agent at arterial time at the TAP stage, the third at portal time at the abdominal-pelvic (AP) level</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I would like the images to be corrected in a way they don't seem stretched. Also, descriptions of the images should be improved: Example: Fig. 1. Chest CT scan with injection in mediastinal reconstruction Chest CT, postcontrast in mediastinal window A. Axial sectionsslice: esophageal dilation with hydro-aeric stasis (blue arrow). B. Coronal sectionsslice: diffuse esophageal dilatation (blue arrow). Alveolar condensation - consolidation</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Tin Nadarevic</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Rijeka, Croatia</p>