

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_97341
Title of the Manuscript:	Fournier's Gangrene: A Report of Two Cases and Literature Review
Type of the Article	Case report

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)
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)	No Si Si Si Si Si	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	si	
Optional/General comments	I consider that it is not a scientific contribution, since it is only a presentation of cases, which is well presented and with a good discussion from which conclusions cannot be drawn because, as I already said, it is only a presentation of cases and the conclusions should not be exist. In every scientific journal there is a section where cases are presented and that is why I think it is interesting to publish it in that section if the editor wants it that way.	

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:	Rodrigo Azolas Marcos
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Chile, Chile