

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Surgery |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRS_120492 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | PATTERNS AND FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH HEARING LOSS AMONG ADULT PATIENTS WITH TYPE 2 DIABETES MELLITUS AT MBARARA REGIONAL REFERRAL HOSPITAL |
| Type of the Article | |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|--|---|
| Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The article is important for the clinicians, endocrinologist, diabetologist, because it is not a frequent complication in this kind of disease, (DM). | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title has more of 15 words. It is too much. A good title should be with no more than 15 words. For example: PATTERNS AND FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH HEARING LOSS AMONG ADULT PATIENTS WITH TYPE 2 DIABETES MELLITUS. The name of the hospital is included in the narrative of the article. | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes, it is comprehensive | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The best is that the Editors of the journal, do a review of the normative of the journal.. It could be that I Occident, we has another principles... For example ,the organization of the article, should have some organizing steps, that could be different in different journal... | |
| Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The article sounds well. But, I suppose, that in the last redaction, will be more convincent. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. | There are 22 references. An article should get a minimum of 30 references. From this references, more than 50% should have lesser than 5 years. In this article, only 22.7% has five years, others are more than this . | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes it is. Some paragraph repeats the same idea, should review this little details. | |
| Optional/General comments | When the authors do changes corresponding with these observations, the article should be publishing. | |

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> | |

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Jose Fernandez Montequin |
| Department, University & Country | National Institute of Angiology and Vascular Surgery, Cuba |