

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_98993
Title of the Manuscript:	The Efficacy of Saline Nasal Irrigation in Chronic Rhinosinusitis: A Single Centre Experience
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 „**lac k of N o v elty**“, 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes 2. Yes 3. No. Abstract is vague. Needs to be re-written after this paper is revised. In the abstract it is mentioned that the study was conducted “from January 2022 to <b>December 2023</b> ” This date needs to be corrected. Again ,in the METHODOLOGY & MATERIALS it is mentioned as “January 2022 to <b>December 2023</b> ” 4. Discussion is carelessly edited. In the very second sentence the word, “irrigation's” appears twice consecutively. These typo errors should be corrected by the author prior to submission. 5. The manuscript has a glaring lacuna. Occasional use & strict use is not clearly specified. The author has not specified the number of days ( or range of days) in Occasional use, as well as that for Strict use. Occasional use & strict use needs to be clearly defined as “x” or more number of days for strict use & similarly for occasional use. <b>There are no statistics showing which symptoms have shown improvement after SNI.</b> 6. References are not recent. Out of 18 references, only 3 are recent.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is acceptable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>The statistics appears to be doctored.</b>	

### 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:	S. M. Naik
Department, University & Country	SHKM Govt Medical College, India