

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2692
Title of the Manuscript:	Gossypiboma: A Patient’s Decade of Abdominal Presentation as a Sequela of a Forgotten Intraperitoneal Foreign Body
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This case report presents a well-documented case of gossypiboma, offering valuable insights into both the clinical and surgical management of retained foreign bodies post-surgery. Strengths •Comprehensive Documentation: The report is thorough, providing a detailed chronological account of the patient’s symptoms, diagnostic workup, and surgical management. •Clear Imaging and Histology Descriptions: The CT scan findings and histological details of the excised mass are well-described, providing valuable insight into the pathology of gossypiboma. Weaknesses • The year of first documented case is wrong •Wrong concept regarding migratory intraluminal foreign body, A majority of migratory intraluminal foreign bodies cause obstruction, very few can cross the ileocecal valve and discharge through the anus. The article gives the impression that a majority of intraluminal foreign bodies discharge through anus with outcausing any complications. •Missed Opportunity to Explore Minimally Invasive Options: While the report mentions laparoscopy, a more in-depth discussion of surgical options could have enhanced the surgical aspect of the review.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The article title is intriguing. No changes are suggested.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. I would suggest deleting the following sentences from abstract. (The pain was more on the left abdominal field that was rarely diffuse. however, she reported normal bowel motions with neither nausea nor vomiting. It was non periodic and not alleviated by the use of common over the-counter analgesics.)	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Except for the history of documented case of Gossypiboma (cited in article and 1859 instead of 1884), even though majority of the references cited in the same article says its 1884 and the mistaken concept of migrating intraluminal foreign body, I find the article scientifically correct and technically sound. The case is very well worked up with a detailed case history and physical examination, Ultrasonography abdomen & pelvis, CT abdomen& pelvis and have a confirmed histopathological diagnosis. The article mentions about the various types and consequences of gossypiboma The citation of Kahn’s recommendations adds strength and lays a pavement for early diagnosis.	

Review Form2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Yes. Suggestions of additional references: 1. Manzella A, Filho PB, Albuquerque E, Farias F, Kaercher J. Imaging of gossypibomas: pictorial review. American journal of roentgenology. 2009 Dec;193(6_supplement):S94-101. 2. Rabie ME, Hosni MH, Al Safty A, Al Jarallah M, Ghaleb FH. Gossypiboma revisited: A never ending issue. International Journal of Surgery Case Reports. 2016 Jan 1;19:87-91. 3. Alemu BN, Tiruneh AG. Gossypiboma: a case series and literature review. Ethiopian journal of health sciences. 2020 Jan 1;30(1).	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Spelling mistakes noted are;i) Enter-cutaneous fistula instead of enterocutaneous fistula, ii)Adhenolysis for Adhesiolysis. Non meaningful phrase or sentences: i) The lesion-specimen was dissected (Figure 2) and multiple necrotized loci of tissues with typical liquefaction was seen suggestive of an old dissolved-contained foreign body (most likely a gauze). ii) Due to a self-body immunological responses, an aseptic gossypiboma is preceded by adhesions formation which encapsulate the foreign body that eventually culminates into granuloma formation.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Athula Treesa Sebastian
Department, University & Country	MVJ Medical College and Research Hospital, India