

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_74827
Title of the Manuscript:	Surgical Separation of Thoraco-omphalopagus Conjoined Twins After SARS-CoV-2 Infection-Thoracic Surgery Perspective: 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Congratulations for the successful operation performed by the authors. However, there are some questions I want to ask. 1- In most of the article, congenital anomaly and surgical technique were mentioned. What we are wondering is, how did you do the covid treatment while preparing this patient for a serious operation. You must provide the details of the Covid-19 treatment. 2- If you did not use a special technique for the Covid-19 patient, you did not need to explain your surgical technique in such detail, you can shorten it. 3-Conclusion does not reveal anything new. Even if only the title is looked at, it can be understood that the infection will affect the recovery in the postoperative period.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Thoracic surgery is mentioned in the title, but cardiothoracic surgery perspective is mentioned in the conclusion. Which one is right?	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Now, every subject with covid-19 disease is turned into an article. Instead, sharing the successful covid-19 treatment in these patients and telling the differences of the technique may contribute to the literature.	

### 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:	<b>Kemal Karapınar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Health Sciences Turkey, Turkey</b>