



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_42348
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of Pedicle Groin Flap for Large Defect of Traumatic Hand and Forearm; 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/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	CLINICAL REPORT Line 40- You say that there was no radial pulse and FCR was disrupted. The absence of pulse in no indicative of arterial damage and in the conditions of the patient exploratory surgery of the artery has to be made to check the status and viability of the artery. Line 43- Which flexors? Superficialis? Profundus? All of them? Line 45- How? You follow a protocol? You administered ATB? Cleaning was made with antiseptic or only with saline? How was covered the wound between the debridements? Line 47- Please detail the technique about the groin flap. Line 51 – How you determine that the patient was “good”? DISCUSSION Line 64 – You start exactly in the same way and the same words than in introduction. Please correct and change text in one of the two paragraphs. Line 64-68 – Please construct a sentence. Don't number the advantages Line 72-80 – Idem for disadvantages	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 49- Please correct Humerus	
Optional/General comments	This report doesn't support anything to actual literature. Although the authors say that this flap is an “old technique”, this technique is used in certain conditions as the recognize. The structure of the paper has to be modified. Paragraphs have to be constructed (it seems a telegraph). Clinical report is poor and needs lots of clarifications, and finally the discussion seems irrelevant, only talking about the anatomy. In my opinion this paper has to be completely revised by the authors and modified conveniently. Quality of images is poor. There are only two new references in bibliography (the rest are older than 15 years)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rafael Sanjuan
Department, University & Country	Cervero Hospital de Denia, Spain