Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Surgery**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRS_111490**
Title of the Manuscript:	**An Audit of antibiotic prophylaxis for laparoscopic cholecystectomy**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	Certainly, a manuscript is of utmost importance to the scientific community. It serves as a formal means of communication among researchers, facilitating the sharing, verification, and replication of scientific knowledge. A high-quality manuscript is crucial for transparency, validity, and the advancement of scientific research. Yes, the title of the article, "An Audit of Antibiotic Prophylaxis for Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy," is appropriate as it clearly indicates the type of study (audit) and specifically relates to the use of antibiotic prophylaxis in the context of laparoscopic cholecystectomy. The title effectively reflects the essence of the research. Yes, the article abstract is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the research, including the background, objective, methods, results, and conclusions. Key information about the use of antibiotics in laparoscopic cholecystectomy and adherence to ASHP guidelines is well-presented. Additionally, the keywords at the end of the abstract further facilitate the identification of the paper's relevance. Yes, the manuscript structure appears well-organized, and the subsections provide a clear overview of the information. Here are a few suggestions you might consider: -Additional Clarifications in Methods: In the "Methods" section, consider adding a few sentences that further explain the process of retrospective analysis and how the data were collected. This could help readers better understand the methodology. -Consideration of Graphs or Tables: In the "Results" section, consider adding graphical representations, tables, or diagrams to illustrate key data. This can further enhance the clarity of the results. -Additional Information in the Discussion: In the "Discussion" section, you might add extra information about the practical implications of your results or discuss potential directions for future research. Based on the provided text, the manuscript appears to be scientifically accurate. Information about the research methodology, results, and discussion is presented in a logical manner. The authors have clearly outlined the study objectives, utilized relevant guidelines (ASHP), and provided specific patient data related to the use of antibiotics in the context of laparoscopic cholecystectomy. It is necessary to cite works from 2019 to 2023. Keep the existing references, only adding new ones	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly**	The English language in this article is generally good. Most sentences are clear and	

communications?	understandable, and the terminology used is appropriate for a scientific paper. However, there is always room for minor improvements. Here are a few suggestions: Some Expressions: In the "METHODS" section, instead of "retrospective audit," you might use the term "retrospective study" to avoid potential misunderstandings.	
Optional/General comments	After a careful review of the entire paper, I have noticed that the paper is well-structured and contains relevant information. Here are a few suggestions for potential improvements: Clarity in Methods: Add a few sentences that further explain the process of retrospective analysis and how the data were collected in the "METHODS" section. This could help readers better understand the methodology. Visual Aid: Consider adding graphical representations, tables, or diagrams to illustrate key data in the "RESULTS" section. This can further enhance the clarity of the results. Simplification of Discussion: Try to simplify sentences in the "DISCUSSION" section to avoid excessive complexity and make it easier for readers to understand. Additional Information in Discussion: Consider adding extra information about the practical implications of your results or discussing potential directions for future research in the "DISCUSSION" section.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mladen Kasalović**
Department, University & Country	**Serbia**