

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_111750
Title of the Manuscript:	Conversion rate of laparoscopic cholecystectomies at the university hospital center ibn rochd : A prospective study over 3 years
Type of the Article	Case study

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript deals with a current theme involving modern medical technology Which is laparoscopic cholecystectomy in one of its validated indications. This path presents notable advantages. This work talks about a capital decision-making situation which is the conversion of laparosurgery to open surgery during cholecystectomy. the manuscript discusses the indications (adhesions, lithiatic cholecystitis, etc.) but not the risk factors for conversion to laparoscopic cholecystectomy in a predominantly female adult population 2. Proposed wording of the title: Indications for laparoscopic cholecystectomy conversions... 3. The summary is incomplete: insufficient results, no conclusion (see manuscript for more details) 4. YES but to be improved according to the suggestions made in the manuscript 5. YES 6. Insufficient references and almost 50% old? see suggestions made in the full manuscript. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	NO COMMENTS	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	A GOOD ORIGINAL WORK TO IMPROVE	
----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--

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:	Saikou Yaya Diakite
Department, University & Country	Universite Gamal Abdel Nasser de Conakry, Guinea