

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Surgery |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRS_129647 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Laparoscopic management of primary omental torsion-Two case report and review |
| 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: 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> |
|--|---|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | There are other diseases in which the presenting symptoms are present. Diseases such as primary appendicitis epiploica, mesenteric panniculitis may also have similar findings and these can be treated conservatively. The definitive diagnosis of these can be made by tomography. Although the treatment was correct in these two patients with torsion of the omentum, intra-abdominal conditions that could have been treated conservatively could have been encountered. A definitive diagnosis could not be made with preoperative ultrasound, but tomography was not performed. Why was a CT scan not considered? In patients in whom a definitive diagnosis could not be made by preoperative ultrasonography, a CT scan is required. This can be added as a criticism of the article. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title of the article is appropriate. | |
| 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 of the article is enough. | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically correct. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | References are sufficient and current. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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: | Güven Erdogrul |
| Department, University & Country | Mersin City Training and Research Hospital. Turkey |