

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_98286
Title of the Manuscript:	CLASSIFICATION OF DIFFICULT LAPAROSCOPIC CHOLECYSTECTOMY BASED ON IDENTIFICATION, DISSECTION AND PROCEDURAL (IDP) PROBLEMS' SOLUTION
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>)

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The authors carry out an interesting study on the difficulty of laparoscopic cholecystectomy, proposing an algorithm for evaluating the difficulty, correlated with each operative time. They thus propose a complex and extremely comprehensive scale of all the particular situations that make laparoscopic cholecystectomy difficult, associated with additional surgical gestures to solve those more difficult cases, much more elaborate compared to other scales, proposed by Ewen A. Griffiths or Michael Sugrue. .</p> <p>The chosen title is eloquent and faithfully reflects the content of the article.</p> <p>The abstract is consistent and realizes the quintessence of the article.</p> <p>The article is very well structured, presenting in detail the Material and Method Chapters, Results that present indications and the scale of difficulty applied to the selected cases, followed by the Discussions chapter, with the scoring of the essential elements, related to the specialized literature.</p> <p>Of course, the material is scientifically correct, which is evident from the clarity and precision of the presentation.</p> <p>The bibliographic indexes are well chosen, although they could be more numerous and a little more updated.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The English used is correct, keywords are chosen correctly, and abbreviations are explained the first time when used in the text.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Cirimbei Ciprian</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania</b>