

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Surgery</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Post-herniorrhaphy pain is a topical issue. It is very much debated. I like the rigor of research. The results are relevant and expected. Maybe if there were more cases they would be statistically significant.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Its enough	
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 work is to the point, very concise. The work deals with the comparison between a self-adhering prosthesis compared to a sutured one and follows the morbidity according to both. It was expected that the unsutured prosthesis would bring less postoperative morbidity, which was and was specified very nicely and legibly .	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I recommend that the paper be accepted and next time there should be at least 100 cases to emphasize the statistically significant difference between the two types of prosthesis.	

#### **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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Costel Bradea</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Grigore T Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy Iasi, Romania</b>