

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRHE_96555
Title of the Manuscript:	ULTRASOUND ASSESSMENT OF PORTAL VEIN DIAMETER IN HEALTHY ADULT WOMEN IN SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA
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.journalajrrhe.com/index.php/AJRRHE/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)	1-Yes , The manuscript is important in scientific community 2-Yes , it is good and suitable title 3-Yes , the abstract is comprehensive but USA that found in the 5th line in abstract should be written with full name ((united states of America)) especially it is used for first time in this manuscript 4-Yes, they are good 5- yes manuscript is scientifically correct 6- NO , the references not recent, the author should use more recent references Follow journal guidelines	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language should be revised	
Optional/General comments	Very good manuscript	

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:	Ahmed Samy El-Shafey
Department, University & Country	Tanta University, Egypt