Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJCRS_87247**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Secondary diverticulum containing multiple stones at the tip of a Meckel's diverticulum: A case report.**
Type of the Article	**Case study**

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/editorial-policy)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Authors have presented a case of Meckel's diverticulum in a 31-year-old male with dual complications of secondary diverticulum due to previous localised perforation and walled off abscess containing enteroliths. They have presented it nicely with beautiful illustrations especially the laparoscopic view showing Meckel's diverticulum kinked and taken serosal patch from the omentum and mesenteric peritoneum causing partial obstruction which may have caused stasis followed by sepsis and walled off perforation which in turn provided nidus for the development of multiple enteroliths subsequently. Overall, the case is rare and managed well with very good presentation. The references are recent and appropriate.	
Minor REVISION comments	However, the manuscript can be improved by minor changes in the title, index words and discussion as shown in the copy of the edited manuscript attached herewith and the legends to illustration can be expanded describing key feature in the figures with preferably some arrows or pointer to the key feature making easier for the reader to see what exactly authors are trying to make a point please,	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is worth accepting after minor revision as suggested.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ramnik Patel**
Department, University & Country	**NUHNHSTrust, UK**