

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_98027
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Clinico-Epidemiological Profile & Associated Risk Factors in Pediatric Inguinal Hernia
Type of the 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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Not much contributory Yes The conclusions of abstract do not adequately summarise the results and conclusions of the study. Yes. The manuscript and methodology is scientifically incorrect at places e.g. the correct age of hydrocoele is 2 years as per standard recommendations at the earliest. A patient presenting with hydrocoele before 2 years should be subjected to watchful wait for spontaneous resolution till 2 years. The discussion mentions that hydrocole cases were operated at 1 year of age. If supporting reference for this age is available in form of metanalysis/ systematic review, kindly mention it. 1. In 1st paragraph of discussion, Males have a somewhat higher risk of hernia than females, at around 5%. Such sentences need to have references 2. Overall, references are labelled in haphazard manner. 3. At places, reference numbers are mentioned in words, that too out of sequence. 4. References should be noted as superscript at the end of corresponding sentence.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	In results, the association between maternal hernia as well as maternal connective tissue disorder and development of hernia/hydrocoele don't have p values in significant range. This denies the association. Contradictorily, the results and discussion continue to mention this association.	

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:	Aditi Deshpande
Department, University & Country	BAV Medical College, India