

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_110000
Title of the Manuscript:	Open Inguinal Hernia Repairs-Current Update:Narrative review article
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 1.7

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>The paper provides a comprehensive review of open inguinal hernia repairs, including methods, complications, and outcomes.</p> <p>A title is fine, but you can make it even more specific by adding a few words that emphasize the focus, such as "Recent Advances in" or "Current Trends in." For example: "Recent Advances in Open Inguinal Hernia Repairs: A Narrative Review".</p> <p>The summary provides an overview of the topic and contains key information on types of open inguinal hernia repair, including Lichtenstein tension free mesh repair, plug and patch repair, Prolene Hernia System, Desarda technique, and sutured repairs such as Shouldice repair, Bassini inguinal hernia repair, and Darning technique . Also, the summary addresses common complications such as relapse and chronic pain.</p> <p>However, to make it more comprehensive, you might consider adding a few additional pieces of information: Specific Results: Add some specific figures on recurrence and complication rates for each of the repair methods described, if available. Future Perspectives: Add sentences that indicate the possibilities of future research in this area or the advantages of new techniques that can be explored.</p> <p>With these additions, the abstract will become even more comprehensive and provide the reader with an even clearer picture of the content of the article.</p> <p>Yes, the structure of the manuscript seems quite adequate and follows the usual form for a literature review article.</p> <p>The manuscript appears to provide a generally accurate overview of topics related to open inguinal hernia repairs. The author discusses the various types of open repairs, including mesh and sutured methods, and provides information on the results of those procedures, including rates of recurrence, chronic pain, and complications.</p> <p>References follow the structure and issues of the research work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is mostly understandable and the writing style is accessible.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper successfully introduces the reader to the topic of inguinal hernias, providing basic information about open repairs. The introduction should emphasize the topicality of the problem and why it is important to research these reparation methods. Clear display of results in relation to types of operations. Consider possible limitations of the studies used to discuss the results. Clearly expressing conclusions and linking them to previous sections. Add the need for future research, especially regarding new techniques.</p> <p>Conclusion: The paper provides a comprehensive review of open inguinal hernia repairs, including methods, complications, and outcomes. Refinement of the introduction and small changes in the structure are recommended to further improve the clarity and strength of the argument. Also, the need for additional research in this area is emphasized.</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:	Mladen Kasalović
Department, University & Country	Serbia