

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_91681
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibiotic Treatment of Uncomplicated Acute -Appendicitis in Children.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<https://www.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-policy>)

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	The manuscript is relevant to the specific scientific community in the area, enriching knowledge about new treatment alternatives for appendicitis in children.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript presents some adjustments that need to be made to facilitate its understanding. Thus, follow the reviewer's suggestions. Throughout the text, the acronyms have no meaning, making it difficult for readers who do not belong to this area to understand. I suggest putting only once the meaning for each acronym.</p> <p>Another point is regarding the classification of age group, is an individual aged 18 years considered a child? Following are the guidelines for each session.</p> <p>Introduction - 2nd and 4th paragraphs are wordy, it is necessary to review so as not to repeat information. In the last paragraph, put only the objective, the outcome must be in the Results section.</p> <p>I suggest reviewing the purpose of the study, the manuscript seems to address a form of treatment. For evaluation, specific instruments used to measure safety and efficacy would be needed.</p> <p>Patients and Methods Place the location of the Hospital (country).</p> <p>Conservative treatment In the 3rd paragraph, review the order of the sentences, as the writing is confusing.</p> <p>Results In the 1st paragraph, I suggest placing the quantity in the Patients and Methods section, and keeping the average age and percentage of sex in this paragraph. The other information I suggest, remove as they have already been mentioned before.</p> <p>From the 2nd paragraph onwards, I suggest maintaining a standardization in the information of the results. Still in the 2nd paragraph, I suggest describing the division of the mentioned groups and their characteristics, how they were formed (successful with NOM and with failure of NOM).</p> <p>Discussion The 3rd paragraph should be in the Result section. I suggest explaining the study by Minneci et al. for it appears to be of great relevance for comparison with the present manuscript.</p> <p>In the 6th paragraph, I suggest citing some studies on the subject.</p> <p>In the 7th paragraph, I believe that there is more important information that should be discussed than just discussing age group.</p> <p>The 8th paragraph should be in the Patients and Methods section.</p> <p>Avoid repeated use of terms such as "In our study".</p> <p>Check paragraph formatting.</p> <p>In the 11th paragraph, review the text. Did the other studies show significant relevance? I didn't understand the last sentence, whose guess, based on what?</p> <p>In the 12th paragraph, I suggest placing the age range of the samples of the cited studies.</p> <p>In the 14th paragraph, what was the oral intake time for each step mentioned?</p> <p>To standardize the information, in paragraph 18, they present percentage numbers and in full.</p> <p>Conclusion The efficacy and safety of this type of treatment was not verified, I suggest reviewing the text as well as the objectives. Abstract Follow the guidelines mentioned above.</p>	
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)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elciana de Paiva Lima Vieira
Department, University & Country	Federal Fluminense University, Brazil