

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_119850
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS, ACCEPTANCE AND BARRIERS OF VASECTOMY AS A FAMILY PLANNING METHOD AMONG MALE RESIDENT DOCTORS AT THE JOS UNIVERSITY TEACHING HOSPITAL
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Answers to the Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Yes, this manuscript is highly important for the scientific community. It provides critical data on the awareness, acceptance, and barriers to vasectomy among a specific and influential group—male resident doctors. By focusing on this demographic, the study highlights both the current gaps in knowledge and the potential for increased acceptance through targeted education, which can significantly influence family planning practices and policies. Is the title of the article suitable? The title is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the study. However, a slight modification could make it more concise: "Awareness, Acceptance, and Barriers of Vasectomy among Male Resident Doctors at Jos University Teaching Hospital." Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and recommendations, providing a clear overview of the research conducted. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The study is well-organized, with clear sections for the introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. This logical flow facilitates understanding and ensures that the reader can easily follow the progression of the research. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, the data analysis is thorough, and the conclusions drawn are well-supported by the data. The study follows standard research practices and employs appropriate statistical methods to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. The references are sufficient and mostly recent, covering relevant studies and providing a solid background for the research. However, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies on vasectomy acceptance and educational interventions, as well as any new guidelines or policies on male contraception from global health organizations. Adding references from similar studies conducted in different regions could also provide a broader context and enhance the discussion. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is written in a clear and professional manner, with appropriate use of technical terminology and a formal tone that is expected in scientific writing. The sentences are well-structured, and the ideas are conveyed logically and coherently. There are no major grammatical or syntactical errors, which ensures that the content is accessible and understandable to an academic audience.</p> <p>However, minor language polishing could further enhance the readability and fluency of the text. For example, ensuring consistency in terminology and refining sentence structures where needed can improve the overall quality of the manuscript. Nonetheless, the current language quality is sufficient for scholarly communication.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript titled "Awareness Acceptance and Barriers of Vasectomy as a Family Planning Method among Male Resident Doctors at the Jos University Teaching Hospital" presents a thorough and significant study that sheds light on the underutilized yet crucial method of male contraception in a specific population.</p> <p>The study is meticulously designed and executed, providing valuable insights into the barriers to vasectomy acceptance among male resident doctors. This research is essential for the scientific community as it addresses the often overlooked aspect of male involvement in family planning and highlights the necessity of targeted educational programs to improve acceptance rates. The findings are poised to inform policy changes and educational initiatives aimed at promoting vasectomy as a viable family planning option.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aleksandar Racz
Department, University & Country	University of Applied Health Sciences, Croatia