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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?
   Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript. Comments: No

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?
   Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

   a. The relevant patient information, including:

      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
      - Main symptoms of the patient
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

   b. The relevant physical examination findings

   c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.
d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: Yes

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?
   Comments: Yes

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.
   Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
   Comments:

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
   Comments: yes

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

Kijima et al., present a single case of a 36-year-old who presented with chronic abdominal pain originating from postoperative adhesions. The authors discuss the importance of Carnett's test as an essential tool for evaluating chronic abdominal pain.

The authors have done an excellent job in the preparation of the manuscript.
Here are my comments and suggestions,

1. Background:
   - If possible, provide a historical perspective on Carnett's test in a line or two and discuss its usefulness briefly in the evaluation of the abdominal pain (acute and chronic)
   - Authors wrote 'Here, we report a case of chronic abdominal pain that took two years to diagnose and which necessitated two operations.

2. Case presentation:

   Though written thoroughly, needs rewriting in a chronological order. Write his presentation to your hospital and then give his presentation to the other hospital in the past history.

   History, exam with vitals, labs, imaging in that order.

   Then differential, other work up, etc.

   - In page 8, the authors wrote, 'Adhesiolysis was performed six months after the patient first visited our hospital.' But in the time line provided, the authors haven't mentioned that adhesiolysis was done in January 2016.

3. Discussion:

   - In page 14, the authors wrote 'Although the indication of laparoscopic adhesiolysis is required to be carefully selected, the case of restricting daily life because of the adhesion should be considered to conduct.' The sentence is confusing. Consider rewriting.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JCMR

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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