

**Review Form 3**

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

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Information is very basic and doesn't contribute anything new to the scientific community.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Lack of Clarity:</b> Some sentences lack clarity and precision, such as "many patients in our setting with t2dm are diagnosed late" which should be more precise about the setting.</li> <li><b>Formatting Issues:</b> Bulleted lists are inconsistently formatted, with some items starting with uppercase letters and others with lowercase.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Looks fine.</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, It is comprehensive</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Methodology: Incomplete, details of data collection are missing.</b></li> <li><b>Redundancy:</b> Repeated information without adding new insights (e.g., "as shown in table 2 above" is repeated unnecessarily).</li> <li><b>Improper Sentence Construction:</b> Run-on sentences and lack of clear sentence structure (e.g., "most of the study participants had normal otoscopic findings with about 1 in 10 having impacted cerumen as shown in table 3 above").</li> <li><b>Statistical Data Presentation:</b> Statistical values are not consistently presented or explained (e.g., "95% ci" should be "95% CI" and explanations for confidence intervals should be consistent).</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> =</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>References – Old and there is no uniformity or numbering of references.</b></li> <li><b>Number of references looks sufficient but very carelessly written with major mistakes.</b></li> <li>Citations are inconsistently formatted, with some including parentheses around the author and year (e.g., "(linnenkamp et al., 2014)") and others not.</li> </ol>	

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Inconsistent Capitalization:</b> Terms such as "diabetes mellitus" (DM) and "type 2 DM" (T2DM) are inconsistently capitalized throughout the text.</li><li>2. <b>Punctuation Errors:</b> Missing or incorrect punctuation, such as double commas ("across the world,," ) and lack of spacing after periods and commas.</li><li>3. <b>Typographical Errors:</b> Mistakes like "D/m" instead of "DM" and "Of" instead of "Of".</li><li>4. <b>Sentence Structure:</b> Sentences are often run-on or awkwardly structured, making them difficult to read and understand.</li><li>5. <b>Acronyms and Abbreviations:</b> Acronyms like "DM", "HL", and "T2DM" are not consistently defined on first use and sometimes are used without explanation.</li><li>6. <b>Inconsistent Terminology:</b> Terms like "hearing loss" and "HL" or "glycemic control status" and "poor glycemic control" are used interchangeably without clear consistency.</li></ol>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Khaleel Ahmed Manik</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Integral Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Integral University, India</b>