

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | I think it's a <b>very challenging manuscript</b> as it expresses a <b>common problem</b> in patients who need multiple interventions.  |  |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)   | It is a <b>suitable title</b> for this article.   |  |
| 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> .  |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.  | There are <b>many scientific mistakes</b> as:<br>1-The author mention that the hernial defect lies in the <b>infraumbilical fascia</b> which is <b>not true anatomical term</b> .<br>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> .<br>3- - He / She does <b>not mention</b> the <b>haemoglobin level</b> after correction <b>they proceed upon it</b> .<br>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.<br>5- They do <b>not mention the safety measure</b> they use for such 2 ultra major operations.<br>6- <b>Conclusion is very redundant</b> and need to be <b>more abbreviated</b> . |  |
| 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> .   |  |
| 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.   |  |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments   |   |  |

Review Form 3

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:                            | Ahmad Elhussein Mohamed      |
| Department, University & Country | Suez Canal University, Egypt |