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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The manuscript is interesting and significant for the scientific community as it addresses a pathology with a very low incidence, rarely encountered in emergency surgery. This literature review is extremely valuable for all surgeons, regardless of their level of experience, whether they are beginners or experts, and it provides an important contribution to this pathology, creating new perspectives on the subject. Given that this condition can affect individuals of any age, with specific diagnostic and therapeutic challenges at the extremes of age, its relevance is undeniable.  In general, diverticular pathology is more frequently symptomatic in children, while in adults, it is usually a symptomatic. The content of this manuscript can contribute to a deeper understanding of existing knowledge and to the development of future consensus guidelines, even though there is currently no universally accepted consensus regarding the resection of incidentally discovered Meckel’s diverticulum. Considering its relevance to future research, I believe this manuscript is of significant importance. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | It is OK |  |
| 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. | In the abstract, there is an error stating that the patient was initially diagnosed with an incarcerated paraumbilical Littre’s hernia based on clinical examination and imaging studies. In reality, the diagnosis was made intraoperatively. I believe this should be corrected to reflect the accurate sequence of events. | Corrected, please let me know if any further corrections needed. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is a review that provides an update on a rare pathology with an extremely uncommon complication involving a foreign body. This condition is often challenging to diagnose and is rarely encountered in emergency surgery services. It significantly enhances the theoretical and practical knowledge of this pathology by incorporating the opinions and approaches of numerous specialists and experts in the field.  Additionally, I believe it would be beneficial to include ultrasound images, standard radiological images, characteristic CT images focused on the herniated area, and particularly on the foreign body, if available. It is well known that the sensitivity and specificity of each diagnostic method vary significantly and largely depend on the expertise of the specialist interpreting the images. These images could enhance the clarity and practical value of the manuscript for clinicians. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Yes. I have no suggestions. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and the style is clear and concise. |  |
| Optional/General comments | **Relevance and Originality of the Research:**  I have evaluated the relevance of the topic and the originality of the research. The chosen subject, "Rare Case of Littre Hernia Complicated by Perforated Meckel's Diverticulum, A Radiological Challenge: A Case Report and Review of the Literature," addresses a condition with a very low incidence. The discovery of a Meckel's diverticulum is generally incidental, with the diagnosis typically established intraoperatively. The presented case is particularly interesting as it required the simultaneous presence of three rare conditions: the existence of Meckel’s diverticulum, the presence of a hernia, and the perforation of the diverticulum during its course, a scenario that occurs very rarely.  The manuscript discusses a relatively uncommon clinical situation that should still be considered in the presence of an abdominal wall hernia. At the same time, it highlights an important pathology in the field, where early diagnosis can reduce morbidity and hospitalization duration. The presented case had a postoperative hospitalization of 10 days. Therefore, this manuscript is valuable, contributing to a better understanding of the subject and providing a useful update for any professional in this sector.  **Methodology:**  The methodology used is clear and well-justified, based on a real case presentation supplemented by a literature review, utilizing studies included in systematic reviews. These involved a relatively large number of patients, which further enhances the value of this manuscript.  **Results and Interpretation:**  The results are clearly and logically presented in the manuscript, and their interpretation is based on data obtained from retrospective analysis. However, considering that the bibliography includes only 8 references, with the oldest dating from 2000 and the most recent from 2024, it demonstrates a serious focus by the authors on novelty. Additionally, it would be beneficial and appropriate to include ultrasound images and possibly standard radiological images if available. What I believe should be added are elements of differential diagnosis.  **Structure and Clarity:**  The manuscript is well-structured and easy to follow.  **References and Citations:**  The authors have cited 8 relevant works in the field, covering the period from 2000 to 2024, most of which are recent and sufficient in number.  **Conclusion:**  The manuscript meets most criteria and does not require significant modifications. It can be incorporating the recommended images, if available. | Thank you so much, appreciate your review |
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