

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Overall an amazing and successful procedure of separating thoraco-omphalopagus conjoined twins, especially after covid-19 infection, which makes the circumstance even more complex. Congratulations! It is valuable to record and publish every step so that people can learn and refer from this successful operation in the future. Therefore, I suggest that this manuscript can be added more figures of details of the operation, for example, more detailed figures of reconstruction of the pericardium, and close the thoracic and abdominal cavity of Baby A.	
Minor REVISION comments	Authors could consider adding some explanations on figures. I believe that when people read/skim a surgery case study manuscript, figures are always the first section to catch eyes.	
Optional/General comments	It is interesting that Baby A seemed received more complicated procedures while recovered even faster than Baby B. Also, I was not sure when you wrote this manuscript- probably right after babies got discharged, but if there was some follow up that would be even better. These are two topics that could be considered to include in discussion, optionally.	

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:	Ming Liu
Department, University & Country	Worcester Polytechnic Institute, USA