

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript addresses an important and often under-discussed aspect of family planning: vasectomy among male medical resident doctors in Nigeria.</p> <p>2. Yes, title is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes. Challenges to vasectomy among male resident physicians at the Jos University Teaching Hospital is identified in the abstract. Male sterilization through vasectomy prevents sperm from exiting the testes, empowering men to manage their own contraception. A stratified proportionate random selection strategy was employed to choose male resident physicians from JUTH. The study discovered that worries about post-procedure regrets and the desire for more children had an impact on negative opinions of vasectomy. It suggests encouraging vasectomy by means of educational initiatives that offer evidence-based knowledge, facilitating improved counselling in conjunction with birth control consultations.</p> <p>4. The structure is well-organized and follows a logical flow, making it easy to understand the study's purpose, methods, findings and implications. The manuscript generally follows structured format appropriate for a research study, including sections like Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. Subsections within these main sections (e.g., Study Area, Study Population, Data Collection) appear to be logically organized. However, there are some inconsistencies and areas where clarity could be improved, particularly in the presentation of results and discussion of findings.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and relevant covering a range of studies and sources that support the research.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of the study on awareness, acceptance and barriers of vasectomy among male medical resident doctors. Strengths include a clear methodology, detailed data analysis and relevant discussions on the findings.</p> <p>However, there are areas that require improvement:</p> <p>The abstract lacks a succinct summary of key findings. The introduction could benefit from clearer articulation of the study's significance and objectives. Some sections, such as recommendations and conclusions, could be more specific and actionable.</p>	
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nijan Upadhyay
Department, University & Country	Nepal