Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_130444
Title of the Manuscript:	A Case Report on Pneumatosis Intestinalis complicated by pneumoperitoneum.
Type of the Article	Case report

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/</u> Benefits for Reviewers: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers</u>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Pl part in the manuscript. I 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.	This manuscript provides valuable insight into the rare clinical presentation of pneumatosis intestinalis (PI) complicated by pneumoperitoneum. It highlights the diagnostic challenges and surgical decisions required in such cases. The case adds to the limited literature on PI and its varied etiologies, reinforcing the need for a careful clinical and radiological approach	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title 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 is comprehensive but could briefly mention the role of imaging techniques in diagnosis and the significance of post-operative follow-up in managing such cases.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate, but the discussion could benefit from a clearer distinction between different etiological theories and their relevance to the presented case.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are mostly recent but could be enhanced by including more recent studies on PI and pneumoperitoneum from 2023 and beyond.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, though minor grammatical improvements could be made for clarity and flow.	
Optional/General comments	Although the report mentions taking samples for histopathological examination, the results or relevance of these findings are not provided, The report ends with the patient being discharged with ongoing abdominal discomfort. It would be useful to discuss the long-term prognosis for patients with PI, particularly how recurrent episodes are managed and whether any complications are typically expected in such cases.	

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed v highlight that part in the manusc his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vinay Khanna
Department, University & Country	Manipal Academy of Higher Education, India

ck (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that cript. It is mandatory that authors should write nere)

d with reviewer, correct the manuscript and uscript. It is mandatory that authors should write