

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_110533
Title of the Manuscript:	An Update on the Protocols for Dealing with Refractory Cases of Acute vs Chronic Sinusitis in Primary Care Management Using Conservative Techniques
Type of the Article	Review

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>After my evaluation of the manuscript, here are my responses to each of the questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, this manuscript provides a valuable synthesis of current knowledge and protocols on an important healthcare topic - refractory sinusitis. It outlines key challenges and future directions for improving patient outcomes. 2. Yes, the title accurately reflects the focus on literature review and conservative management approaches. 3. Yes, the abstract concisely summarizes all major aspects of the review - definitions, protocols, advances. 4. Yes, the structure with sections on definitions, acute/chronic protocols, updates/advances is logical and aids comprehension. 5. Yes, the analysis and discussions demonstrate strong scientific understanding and critical assessment throughout. 6. Yes, references are ample and up-to-date from reputable sources like Cochrane and major journals. Additional references are not necessary as the main aspects have sufficient support. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Minor Revision Comments:</p> <p>Yes, language use is clear and scholarly overall with some minor areas that could be tightened. But this does not affect suitability for publication after edits.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In summary, I see only minor areas for improvement and believe this manuscript will make a solid contribution on this clinically important topic after edits. The reviewers have done quality analysis and synthesis.</p> <p>I suggest only minor edits to enhance clarity and conciseness in select areas. With these minor revisions, this manuscript would serve as a valuable contribution on this topic.</p> <p>Minor areas for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some lengthy sentences could be simplified 2. A few statements could be supported by additional references 3. Introduction could more strongly highlight the significance and knowledge gaps 4. Implications and future directions could be expanded on in the conclusion 5. Please recheck spellings and grammar 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santhosh Kumar Rajamani
Department, University & Country	MAEER MIT PUNE's MIMER Medical College, India