

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_112266</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PROFILE OF LAPAROSCOPIC APPENDECTOMY COMPLICATIONS IN A PRIVATE HOSPITAL IN THE NORTHERN REGION OF BRAZIL, EASTERN AMAZON</b>
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Here are my thoughts on the review criteria for this manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes. This manuscript makes an important contribution by providing rigorous data on complications of laparoscopic appendectomy in an understudied region. The findings can help optimize outcomes for this common surgery.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title "Profile of laparoscopic appendectomy complications in a private hospital in the Northern region of Brazil, Eastern Amazon" is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the article.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract provides a good overview of the key aspects of the study - background, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. It summarizes the main findings and implications well.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The structure and organization of the manuscript sections (introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion) follow a standard scientific format and are appropriate. The subsections within each part are logically structured.</b></li> <li>5. <b>The manuscript appears scientifically sound overall. The background provides relevant context and the methods are clearly described. The results are thoroughly presented and the discussion interprets the findings appropriately in light of prior literature. The conclusions are supported by the data.</b></li> <li>6. <b>The references seem sufficient to provide context and support for the study. Most references are recent, published within the last 5 years. The inclusion of some seminal older papers on appendicitis and laparoscopic appendectomy is also appropriate for background.</b></li> </ol> <p>If any additional references could further strengthen the manuscript, I would suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A systematic review or clinical practice guideline on diagnosis and management of appendicitis to support background and methods.</li> <li>- An epidemiological study on appendicitis incidence specifically in the geographic region of interest.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall the manuscript is well-written, follows standard format, and presents scientifically sound methods and findings on this topic. With only minor revisions, I believe the manuscript would make a good contribution to the literature.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arjun Chinnappa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, India</b>