

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_125944
Title of the Manuscript:	“A Case report on Key to Gastric Outlet Obstruction”
Type of the Article	Case report

**General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

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

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. first, I differ from the author's opinion, as a rare case. Mention cases are very common. 2. Adequate importance is not given to primary pathology, as no endoscopic, radiological images or histopathology report is provided by the author. 3. Nowhere does it mention satisfactorily what was the need for emergency surgical intervention, its timing, and patients' preoperative preparation. 4. The discussion lacks scientific content it is just case history repeated in discussion. 5. I would advise the author to get help from senior faculty before submitting the case report to the journal.	Okay
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. It is not key which is causing Gastric outlet obstruction. Rather it can be - "incidentally detected gastric outlet obstruction in patients with foreign body ingestion"	Noted
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.	No The discussion part needs to be rephrased properly with scientific content.	Done as suggested
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I don't think it is scientifically robust and technically sound. Either 1. Adequate details not proved by the author, hence it looks haphazard. 2. The author interprets a common case as a rare case. 3. regarding approach many questions remain unanswered at the end of the discussion.	Noted
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No 1. References need to be recent and relevant. 2.Adequate references not given	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	Requesting author to 1. Check spelling mistakes 2. Check Grammatical mistakes 3. Mention in order the Sequence of events from patient presentation till the surgery/discharge.	All corrections are made

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	