

Review Form (Research)

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_158656
Title of the Manuscript:	Late-Presenting Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia in an adolescent with Gastric Volvulus and Intrathoracic Ectopic Kidney: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Research Article

PART 1 (Importance of the manuscript)

	Comments of the Reviewers	Author’s Feedback
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.	It presents a unique case which is challenging for the surgeon.	

PART 2.1 (Objective Evaluation)

	Rating of the Reviewers	Author’s Feedback
<b>1. Is the title clear and appropriate for the study?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2	I have worked on the title to make it a little concise: Congenital diaphragmatic hernia with gastric volvulus and pancreatitis in an adolescent: A Case Report
<b>2. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
<b>3. Are the keywords appropriate and useful?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
<b>4. Is the background information of the paper sufficient and well organized?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
<b>5. Are the research objectives/hypotheses clearly stated?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	—
<b>6. Is the literature review relevant and up to date?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	—
<b>7. Is the research methodology appropriate for the study?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	N/A	—
<b>8. Were ethical issues properly addressed (if applicable)?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
<b>9. Are the results presented clearly?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	N/A	—
<b>10. Are tables and figures clear, relevant, and necessary?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	-
<b>11. Does the discussion relate findings to existing literature?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
<b>12. Are the conclusions supported by the data?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	N/A	—
<b>13. Are the limitations of the study discussed?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	N/A	—

Review Form (Research)

<b>14. Are the references relevant and sufficient (in number)?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
<b>15. Is the manuscript written in clear and understandable language?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—

PART 2.2 (Subjective Evaluation)

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	I recommend to shorten the title.	I have worked on the title to include pancreatitis and made it a little concise: Congenital diaphragmatic hernia with gastric volvulus and pancreatitis in an adolescent: A Case Report
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> s If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	Yes	—
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically correct?</b>  If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement .	Yes	—
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent?</b> (YES or NO)  If your answer is NO, please provide clear suggestion for improvement.	Yes	—
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> (YES or NO)  (If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	I recommend correcting the name of the suture material used for the procedure in generic name rather than the brand name.	I have changed the name of the suture from brand name to generic name – polypropylene 2-0

PART 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author’s Feedback
<p>You are hereby suggested to include following recent references to improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>Zhu, Y., Wu, Y., Pu, Q., Ma, L., Liao, H., &amp; Liu, L. (2016). Minimally invasive surgery for congenital diaphragmatic hernia: a meta-analysis. Hernia, 20(2), 297-302.</p>	<p><b>Added to the manuscript</b></p>