

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_103031
Title of the Manuscript:	Post-traumatic Mesenteric Pseudocyst Due to Bicycle Handlebar Injury
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>ORIGINALITY: (*)</b> - Does the paper clearly point out differences from related research? Yes - Are the problems or approaches new? yes For example, does the paper: address a new problem or one that has not been studied in much depth? yes introduce an area that appears promising, or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives? yes</p> <p><b>SIGNIFICANCE (*)</b> - Is the work important? yes - Does it advance the state of the art? yes - Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view? yes</p> <p><b>TECHNICAL QUALITY (*)</b> - Is the paper technically sound, with compelling arguments? yes</p> <p>- If the paper describes an application, is there: a clear and compelling motivation for why the chosen approach is important? a careful description of the design and implementation of the system? a thorough evaluation of the system with respect to a clearly-stated set of functional and quality requirements? yes</p> <p><b>QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (*)</b> - Is the paper clearly written? yes - Does the paper motivate the research? yes - Are results clearly described and evaluated? yes - Is the paper well organized? yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yusef Farhaoui</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Moulay Ismail University, Morocco</b>