

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_130081
Title of the Manuscript:	Feasibility and Safety of Concomitant Abdominal Procedures in a Low-Resource Setting: A Surgical Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

PART 1: 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. A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I think it’s a very challenging manuscript as it expresses a common problem in patients who need multiple interventions.	Thank you very much for taking the time to meticulously review this work and for your thoughtful comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is a suitable title for this article.	Thank you for your review comment.

### Review Form 3

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 <b>abstract</b> of the article is <b>comprehensive</b> .	Thank you for your review comment.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>There are <b>many scientific mistakes</b> as:</p> <p>1-The author mention that the hernial defect lies in the <b>infraumbilical fascia</b> which is <b>not true anatomical term</b>.</p> <p>2- He / She also should mention <b>the name of the classification</b> according to which he / she classifies the <b>degree of abdominal lipodystrophy and its reference</b>.</p> <p>3- - He / She does <b>not mention</b> the <b>haemoglobin level</b> after correction <b>they proceed upon it</b>.</p> <p>4- According to their intervention they use an on lay mesh repair for the hernial defect and it is <b>better to use the preperitoneal approach</b> for such large defect in addition to the complication of the on lay mesh repair.</p> <p>5- They do <b>not mention the safety measure</b> they use for such 2 ultra major operations.</p> <p>6- <b>Conclusion is very redundant</b> and need to be <b>more abbreviated</b>.</p>	<p>1.The descriptive term “infraumbilical fascia” has been removed from the manuscript.</p> <p>2. The degree ofabdominal lipodystrophy was determined based on the Pitanguy's classification which can be found as reference number 6 on page 13.</p> <p>3. The haemoglobin level after correction is 11.3 g/dL. This correction has been made in the case presentation on page 5.</p> <p>4. Thank you for your feedback. We have had positive experiences with onlay mesh repair, regardless of the defect size, which is why we chose to use it for the index case.</p> <p>5. The safety measures we implemented includedthorough preoperative planning by our team, which consisted of general surgeons, plastic surgeons and gynaecologists. We were meticulous and focused on achieving haemostasis to minimize blood loss. After completing the gynaecological procedures, we changed the instruments to reduce the risk of infections and wound complications. Adequate drainage of the subcutaneous space and proper use of antibiotics were also ensured. Additionally, weencouraged early ambulation for the patient while wearing an abdominal binder to reduce the risk of venous thromboembolism. These details have been included in the case presentation on pages 6 and 7.</p> <p>6. The conclusion has been revised to be more concise, reducing the word count from 132 to 83.</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References need to be <b>more updated</b> with <b>correct writing</b> .	References 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 have been included in the updated list.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The <b>language/English quality</b> of the article is <b>acceptable</b> for scholarly communications.	Thank you for your review comment.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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