

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_126912
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Evaluation Of Chronic Groin Pain Following Use Of Self Gripping Versus Sutured Mesh In Open Lichtenstein Hernioplasty, A Randomised Controlled Trial
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper is opening the door for a solution for a big problem after inguinal hernia repair specially pain and foreign body sensation. Its very important to do research on such subject to see a new solutions for these problems	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	We need to add paragraph with title for every section like methods , results, conclusion .etc.. He needs to show how he selected the patients what is inclusion and exclusion criteria and how the two groups be defiend.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The problem that the paper is talking about is very crucial as the patients may complain of chronic pain that wont be relived with ordinary medication that may force us to use methods like epidural anaesthesia just to relief the pain .	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	He need to use recent papers after 2020 as there are many updates on this subject	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Andrew Morcos Azmy Kirolos
Department, University & Country	Ain Shams University, Egypt