

Paper: **“Strangulated Richter's Hernia in an Indirect Inguinal Hernia”**

**Submitted: 23 March 2023**

**Accepted: 21 June 2023**

**Published: 30 June 2023**

Corresponding Author: Kabira Falousse

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n18p113

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bousakhria Mahmoud

Faculté de Médecine de Constantine Université, Algeria

Reviewer 2: Doina Georgescu

“Victor Babes” University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania

Reviewer 3: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title of the paper is clear and adequate to the content of the article

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Given the case report format, the abstract contains only some of these parts. Chapters related to introduction, case report and discussions clearly stated the most important aspects of this rare clinical situation.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

There are many grammare errors and spelling mistakes, some of them making very difficult to clearly understand what exactly did the authors mean.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Non aplicable

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Generally speaking the body of the text is acceptable, but should be rewritten. The second paragraph contains an abbreviation CDS, which I believe came from French (cul de sac), that was not clealy explained. In English we prefer the expression "pouch of Douglas" .

What did the authors mean by affirmations such as : "After conditioning of the patient's general condition.." ?

The expression "postoperative course was simple", translated probable from French( suite simple) should be replaced by good outcome.

The last paragraph from the body of the text contans a very long frase , giving the reader hard time to understand its real meaning. I'd suggest smaller sentences.

Figures also got issues. Fig 1 and 2 should have arrows pointed at the described lesions. Fig 3 should be written in English.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Besides minor grammatical errors, conclusions are accurate and supported by the content of the paper.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

I believe references are comprehensive and appropriate.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

It's mandatory that authors should correct grammatical errors and improve some phrase constructions.

They should also try to find a proper narrative style in order to better deliver " the take home messages" of the present article.

-----

-----

Reviewer G:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is clear.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract needs improvement and should be more comprehensive.  
The abbreviations should be clarified.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The manuscript contains a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. These errors and mistakes should be detected and rewritten.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Not applicable

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The paper needs improvement and more explanation.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusions are not comprehensive.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references should be carefully revised both in the reference section and in the text.

The references don't match the APA style.

Most of the references are old versions.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

-----

-----

Reviewer I:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

yes

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

yes

but:keywords are in alphabetical order

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

title of figure 3:it must be in english

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

yes

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

yes

but: title of figure 3:it must be in english

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

1. it is preferable to specify the type of radiological imaging
2. do not insert a reference in the conclusion

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

YES

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

interesting article but a minor revision is necessary

-----