

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_96536
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing Post-operative Scrotal Oedema and Surgical Site Infection Between Open and Laparoscopic Hernia Repair in Children: Update from Literature Reports
Type of the Article	Review 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)
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. The manuscript is important for the scientific community. However, this manuscript does not seem to add value to the scientific community. Review appears superficial. 2. I would recommend the topic as: "Comparison of Post-operative Scrotal Oedema and Surgical Site Infection Between Open and Laparoscopic Hernia Repair in Children: A review of literatures." 3. On abstract, the results section needs to be re-written. The results of the comparison are not demonstrated by "P" value. This means that the author has not demonstrated the statistical significance of the result of one method over other. 4. Need more data, evidence on discussion. 5. Manuscript needs revision with evidence, more tables and statistics. 6. References are ok.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	With a few proofread by the editor, language is appropriate.	
Optional/General comments	Needs revision by the Author before publication.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Komal B. Gurung
Department, University & Country	University of Tennessee, Methodist University Hospital, USA