

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_106785
Title of the Manuscript:	Geriatric Anesthesia: A Prospective Study on the Prevalence of Comorbidities and Associated Challenges in Elderly Surgical Patients in Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.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>The manuscript is important and adds to the knowledge in scientific community .</p> <p>The title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p><b>ABSTRACT:</b> In the "conclusion" nothing was mentioned about anaesthesia related problems. <b>RESULTS:</b> The "explanations" of the tables and the figures should be written under the tables and the figures and not before. The details of the results written before the tables should be removed. Nothing was mentioned about the associated challenges in anaesthesia, preop and postop in patients with comorbidities. Ethical approval should be written under "Methods" and not after "results" Some of the references are not recent</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>The quality of English language is suitable.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>A good work with the necessary corrections</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kenechukwu Enwonwu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Nigeria Teaching Hospital, Nigeria</b>