SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJCRS_50628**
Title of the Manuscript:	**MANAGEMENT OF SCROTAL HERNIA IN 6 AND 9 MONTHS OLD OUDAH RAMS** **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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	I suggest that the article should be considered for publication with major and minor revisions and some stylistic revisions. In the title author(s) reported management of scrotal hernia in two oudah rams, a 6 months-old and a 9 months-old, but no difference in each case are described and signs observed as testicular swelling were loosely reported as "few months after purchase". So in a very poor discussion no hypothesis was made on the nature of each hernia (acquired or congenital) and to justify the choice of herniorraphy technique (type of stich, which modification of technique described by Gilbert and Fubini were made). Authors should broden their discussion providing relevant references and conclusions should be based on the peculiarities of the cases. Particularly in line 77 the following sentence should be better explained: "Complications of inflammation, of the affected testis and scrotum which necessitated castration two weeks postsurgery where as some cases had good healing without complications [1]"	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 11 "non-veterinarian should be "non-veterinarian" Line 13 herniorrhphy should be herniorrhaphy Line 58 layers were layers were sutured should be layers were were sutured Line 69 The sutures were removed on the 11th day (Fig. 2) should be Fig. 5 A more detailed caption of the figures should be reported: If in Figure 1 are reported pictures of the two cases they should be specified (Figure 1a …; 1b …) In figure 3 single steps of surgical times should be detailed.	
Optional/General comments	In a surgical Journal more details on surgical technique should be reported as surgical times, type of adhesions and the diameter of inguinal hernia hole.	

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:	***Vincenzo La Vaccara***
Department, University & Country	***Università Campus Bio-Medico di Roma, Italy***