

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 scientific topic which author has intended to address is quite important, but the content and writing skill needs to be improved. It neither seems to be a systematic review or a narrative review. Coherence and continuity is lacking. The article body is not scientifically convincing. 2) In my opinion the title should read like this "Comparison of post-operative complications between open and laparoscopic hernia repair in children_ an update from literature review." 3) No 4) No 5) The manuscript doesn't follow PRISMA criteria. It also lacks continuity which is a must even in a narrative review. 6) Number of references given seems adequate. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | 1) I am afraid I can't approve this kind of English language/ quality being suitable for a scholarly communication. | |
| Optional/General comments | 1) I would humbly suggest to authors that they should further strengthen their writing skills and write this topic again from scratch. | |

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) | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name: | Naveed Nabi |
| Department, University & Country | SKIMS Medical College, India |