

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_127577
Title of the Manuscript:	“Comparative evaluation of Cellan Jones repair and Modified Graham patch repair (omentoplasty) for duodenal ulcer perforation”
Type of the 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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is an important topic on the surgical management of a perforated peptic ulcer as the method of closure is important in predicting the morbidity and mortality of this condition.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	May I suggest the following title -Comparative study on the Cellan Jones repair and the modified graham patch repair in the surgical management of perforated duodenal ulcer	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and well written	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the methodology of the study, the inclusion and exclusion criteria are all clearly explained. The results section is well written, and the table and contents are clear and informative. The discussion section should mention more about the surgical management of perforated peptic ulcer disease.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references should be increased, and I am including some suggested references Demetriou G, Chapman M. Primary closure versus Graham patch omentopexy in perforated peptic ulcer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Surgeon. 2022 Jun;20(3):e61-e67. doi: 10.1016/j.surge.2021.04.006. Epub 2021 Jun 3. PMID: 34090810. Mouly C, Chati R, Scotté M, Regimbeau JM. Therapeutic management of perforated gastro-duodenal ulcer: literature review. J Visc Surg. 2013 Nov;150(5):333-40. doi: 10.1016/j.jviscsurg.2013.07.001. Epub 2013 Sep 4. PMID: 24011662. Mohamedahmed AYY, Albendary M, Patel K, Ayeni AA, Zaman S, Zaman O, Ibrahim R, Mobarak D. Comparison of Omental Patch Closure Versus Simple Closure for Laparoscopic Repair of Perforated Peptic Ulcer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Am Surg. 2023 May;89(5):2005-2013. doi: 10.1177/00031348211067991. Epub 2022 Mar 25. PMID: 35332800.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the quality of the English is good.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Kumar Hari Rajah
Department, University & Country	Taylors University School of Medicine and Health Science, Malaysia