

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_105363
Title of the Manuscript:	TRICHOBEZOAR DISCOVERED BY FOGD IN A YOUNG BREASTFEEDING WOMAN
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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, however, the manuscript could be improved for clarity. The abbreviation "FOGD" is not defined in the manuscript, so it is not clear to the reader what it means. If "FOGD" is an abbreviation, it should be written out in full in the title and throughout the manuscript. This would make the title more meaningful and would help the reader to understand the content of the manuscript more easily</p> <p>The title of the article is somewhat suitable, however, the FOGD should be written out in full and the abbreviation be put in parenthesis.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. The sentences need to be reconstructed to give it more clarity. The second and third sentences need to be rephrased and more information given about the identical forms.</p> <p>The other subsections need to be re-written as well, causes of trichobezoar need to be stated in the introductory part.</p> <p>The Manuscript is scientifically correct but needs to be well explained to make meaning to a large audience. The article does not cite any recent references. The most recent reference is from 2005, which is over 18 years old. This is a significant limitation, as the field of research has advanced significantly in the past two decades. The author should search for more recent references to provide a more comprehensive overview of the topic.</p> <p>Additionally, the reference style is inconsistent. Reference 1 is in a different style from References 3, 4, and 20. This is also a limitation, as it makes it difficult for the reader to follow the citations. The author should standardize the reference style to make it easier for the reader to understand.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English in the write-up is not suitable for scholarly communication because it is obscure and difficult to understand. This is likely due to the use of jargon, technical terms, and complex sentence structures. As a result, the meaning of the write-up is lost to a large audience.</p> <p>Here are some suggestions to help improve the clarity of the write-up:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Use simpler language and avoid use of technical terms whenever possible.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Use active voice instead of passive voice.</p> <p>Break up long sentences into shorter ones</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oladunni O. Otanwa
Department, University & Country	University of Uyo, Nigeria