



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_65216
Title of the Manuscript:	Obturator hernia in a male patient; a rare entity: A case report
Type of the Article	Case report

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Congratulations to the authors on performing a successful surgery for a rare case of left obturator hernia. The case report is certainly interesting since this surgical entity is rare, especially on the left side and the treatment options often vary based on the anatomy, acuity, presence of strangulation, etc. The manuscript is written in very simple terms and it requires some major changes in order for it to be more scientifically sound with a appropriate terminology. I would also recommend to focus more attention on the repair itself and different options for obturator hernia repair previously described in the literature as the major discussion point in the discussion section. Please see the specific comments for each aspect of the manuscript:</p> <p>Abstract: There is no need to present specific variables such as height and weight. BMI is the variable used to describe a possible risk factor for hernia occurrence. The essence of "case report" part should mention how the hernia was repaired (where the mesh was sutured to anatomically) rather than just describing the physical exam. Discussion should also mention the comparison to different repair options and what are the reported outcomes for primary repair or TAPP mesh repair. Lastly, the conclusion should focus more on the reason why this case report is interesting and successful, potentially emphasizing that it is possible to repair left obturator hernia with a TAPP method.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction nicely demonstrates the rarity of this case, however it would be important to mention that there are different surgical approaches to repair this type of defect. With that in mind, the discussion can focus more on the different approaches and comparison to your treatment. Phrases such as: "the skinny old lady hernia" should be avoided in scientific literature.</p> <p>Case Report: The essence of this paragraph is the patient's history and physical exam. It is certainly important, but there is no need to provide detailed information regarding the size of the prostate gland and pre- and post- void residuals, but rather focus on the repair itself and how it was managed surgically. I would encourage you to provide more details regarding the type of mesh used, the anatomical location where the tacks were placed, etc. The history and physical, pre-operative imaging should take up one paragraph and the rest of the case report should focus on surgical management and how the patient did post-operatively.</p> <p>Discussion: Nice job on including the information about incidence of obturator hernia and possible structures that can be involved in the hernia. Again, this part of the case report should focus more on comparing the surgical management in your case and other available approaches previously presented in the literature rather than just describing known physical exam findings of obturator hernia. It would be interesting to see what are the outcomes and success rates of this or similar repair previously presented in the literature.</p> <p>Conclusion: Lastly, conclusion should focus more on the reason why your case is interesting and how this surgical approach can provide a successful treatment for patients with strangulated obturator hernia.</p> <p>I would advise to review the grammatical and spelling mistakes or obtain a proof-reader to ensure that the scientific terminology and English version of this manuscript is well written with no mistakes.</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adam Studniarek</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, USA</b>