

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_124888
Title of the Manuscript:	Gossypiboma, the hidden enemy of an emergency caesarean section – a rare case report and review
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it highlights a rare but significant post-surgical complication, gossypiboma, which often goes unreported due to its medicolegal implications. By presenting a detailed case with a decade-long history, it underscores the importance of vigilance in surgical practice and patient follow-up. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on the diagnostic challenges and the long-term consequences of retained foreign bodies, offering valuable lessons for preventing similar cases. However, it would benefit from more in-depth analysis of preventive strategies and recent advancements in surgical safety protocols.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive but could benefit from some revisions for clarity, flow, and completeness.</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Objectives: The abstract should clearly state the objective or aim of the case report. For example, "This case report aims to highlight the diagnostic and surgical challenges in managing a decade-old gossypiboma." Key Investigations: The mention of the diagnostic tools (e.g., CT scan) is good, but specifying why these investigations were chosen and their relevance could add value. Outcome: The abstract mentions the excised mass but does not describe the patient's long-term outcome after surgery. Including a brief note about the patient's recovery, as reflected in the case presentation, would complete the summary. <p>Suggested Deletions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Redundancy: There is some repetition in describing the pain and abdominal presentation. Streamlining this section would make the abstract more concise. Non-Essential Details: While it's important to note that the pain wasn't alleviated by over-the-counter analgesics, it can be mentioned in a shorter, more direct way to focus on the key findings. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The overall structure of the manuscript follows a standard case report format, but there are some areas that could be enhanced for better clarity and flow. Here's an evaluation of the subsections and structure:</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it provides a clear and detailed presentation of a rare clinical case, supported by appropriate diagnostic and surgical interventions. The use of imaging techniques, such as a CT scan, to confirm the diagnosis of gossypiboma is accurate and reflects current best practices. The histopathological findings further validate the diagnosis and offer a thorough understanding of the condition's pathology. Additionally, the discussion is grounded in relevant literature, highlighting the rarity of the condition while drawing comparisons with previous cases, which enhances the manuscript's scientific rigor.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient, but many of them are not very recent, with a majority being published before 2020. Given the evolving nature of surgical practices and the increasing focus on surgical safety protocols, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies to reflect the latest advancements in the field of gossypiboma management and prevention.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the manuscript is generally clear but requires improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication. There are several areas where sentence structure, grammar, and clarity can be enhanced for better readability and fluency. Some sentences are long, making them difficult to follow, and there are occasional typographical errors and inconsistent use of tenses.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <p>1. Grammar and Syntax: Some sentences are awkwardly phrased or grammatically incorrect. For instance, "the pain was more on the left abdominal field that was rarely diffuse" can be rephrased to "the pain was predominantly localized to the left abdominal region and was infrequently diffuse."</p> <p>2. Clarity and Conciseness: There is some repetition in the description of the patient's symptoms and clinical findings. These can be streamlined to make the text more concise and focused.</p> <p>3. Consistency: Ensure consistency in tense and medical terminology throughout the manuscript. At times, present and past tenses are mixed inappropriately.</p> <p>4. Scholarly Tone: While the manuscript communicates the case well, a more formal tone and precise medical language are necessary to enhance its scholarly quality.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Presentation: Overall, the manuscript presents a rare and clinically significant case that adds value to the existing literature on gossypiboma. However, to enhance its impact, further refinement in language, structure, and flow is recommended.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Figures: Ensure that the figures and images are of high quality and that they are clearly referenced within the text. Captions should be detailed enough to stand on their own.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Discussion Depth: While the discussion is informative, incorporating more in-depth analysis, including preventive measures and advancements in surgical protocols, would provide greater value to the readers.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Readability: Consider working on the clarity and conciseness of the manuscript to make it easier for readers to follow the progression of the case and its implications.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>Sanyal Kumar</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>All India Institute of Medical Sciences, India</p>