

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 manuscript provides a comparative analysis of Cellan Jones Repair and Modified Graham Patch Repair (MGPR) for managing duodenal ulcer perforations, highlighting their outcomes and complications. It emphasizes MGPR's superior leak prevention despite longer surgery and higher complication rates. The findings contribute to evidence-based surgical decision-making and personalized patient care.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. The title of the article is 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.	The abstract is comprehensive but could be improved by briefly highlighting the clinical significance of the comparison, specifying randomization criteria, and including statistical significance of results. It should summarize overall success rates and explicitly state clinical implications. Details on specific complications can be generalized unless crucial to the findings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with a clear aim, detailed methodology, and robust analysis comparing Cellan Jones Repair and MGPR for duodenal perforations. Its strengths include a well-designed randomized controlled trial, comprehensive analysis, and contextualized discussion. However, limitations like small sample size, lack of confidence intervals, and minor formatting issues should be addressed. Expanding on clinical implications and procedural details would enhance clarity and practical relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally comprehensive but include some older studies. Adding more recent literature, such as systematic reviews, studies on minimally invasive techniques, and current guidelines, would enhance the manuscript's relevance and evidence base. This would provide a more up-to-date perspective on the treatment of perforated duodenal ulcers.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article's English is suitable for scholarly communication but requires minor revisions to enhance clarity and polish. Strengths include scientific rigor, logical structure, and well-presented data. Improvements are needed for typographical consistency, simplification of complex sentences, and better scholarly tone to achieve greater readability and precision.	
<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:	Mukesh Kumar Shukla
Department, University & Country	Hygia Institute of Pharmacy, India