

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_102421
Title of the Manuscript:	Negative Appendectomy Rates -Current Prospective-Review Article
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It is important, by clearing up unknowns due to imprecise diagnoses that result in negative appendectomies. This provides less bias in preoperative decisions.</p> <p>the title is appropriate</p> <p>Both the abstract and the text are clear and understandable.</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript corresponds to the objective pursued as an article.</p> <p>The author applied a logical sequence in the development of the work.</p> <p>The author used a wide and current bibliography. It should be noted that citation errors were made in some parts of the text, which were pointed out in the comments in the revised paper. The author is required to pay attention to this aspect.</p> <p>The author must avoid the use of personal verbs and use the impersonal. Although this occurred twice in the text, it is educational for the author to know this detail in the future edition of the work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A nuestro parecer el inglés está bien manejado. In our opinion, English is well managed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>We consider that the work has technical rigor to be published, after amending the statements made,</p>	

[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:	Luis Remedios Hernández
Department, University & Country	Cuba