

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_92205
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of Preputial And Buccal Mucosal Grafts In Two-Stage Repair Of Severe Proximal Hypospadias.
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-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	<p>My comments on the manuscript are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are many spelling and grammatical errors that need to be corrected.• Authors should write in the introduction section as in which cases need a graft, which kind of grafts are used for defective urethral plate, and which grafts are preferred more.• They should write the ethics committee number and state that they have received the consent form.• They did not specify which statistical method they used.• Did the authors preserve the urethral plate in all patients? Have they had to cut the urethral plate in all patients with severe ventral penile curvature without making a U incision?• The image to the right of the figure 4 looks more like a flap than a graft.• All results should be given in a table.• It is seen that no comparison statistics have been made. p values are lacking.• It should be stated whether the results of the follow-up evaluations of the patients are statistically significant. There is also no comparison of PPPS.• The discussion section should be rewritten, the paragraphs as a whole will make it more understandable.• The first paragraph of the discussion section should be in the results section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mete Kaya
Department, University & Country	University of Health Sciences, Türkiye