

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.	This late presentation of diaphragmatic hernia is rare. But CT pictures are not attached, so it is not clear whether it was CDH or eventration.	

PART 2.1 (Objective Evaluation)

	Rating of the Reviewers	Author's Feedback
1. Is the title clear and appropriate for the study? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
2. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
3. Are the keywords appropriate and useful? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
4. Is the background information of the paper sufficient and well organized? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
5. Are the research objectives/hypotheses clearly stated? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
6. Is the literature review relevant and up to date? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
7. Is the research methodology appropriate for the study? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	NA	—
8. Were ethical issues properly addressed (if applicable)? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
9. Are the results presented clearly? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
10. Are tables and figures clear, relevant, and necessary? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	—
11. Does the discussion relate findings to existing literature? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	—
12. Are the conclusions supported by the data? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	-
13. Are the limitations of the study discussed? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	NA	—
14. Are the references relevant and sufficient (in number)?	4	

Review Form (Research)

Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable		
15. Is the manuscript written in clear and understandable language? 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)
Is the title of the article suitable? If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	Yes	—
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? s If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	Yes	—
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement .	Yes	—
Are the references sufficient and recent? (YES or NO) If your answer is NO, please provide clear suggestion for improvement.	Yes	—
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? (YES or NO) (If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail.)	No	—

PART 3

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

	Author’s Feedback
CT pictures and X-ray pictures would be useful to understand the limitations of X-rays. And to clarify whether it was CDH or eventration. Usually in gastric volvulus, fixation is done. A paragraph about why fixation was not done would be useful for the resident. CT pictures and X-ray pictures to differentiate it from eventration are needed.	Yes, the CECT report clearly stated a 96 mm defect in the diaphragm through which the abdominal viscera herniated (CECT image added). Since it was a secondary volvulus (due to CDH) and we eliminated the cause (repaired the defect), only detorsion was done, as it has shown an equal success rate when compared to gastropexy (added to the manuscript along with a supporting reference). CECT image added.