

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_115055
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Influencing Regional Lymph Node Metastasis from Laryngeal Carcinoma
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1) Although the methods employed and the results obtained may contribute to the existing body of knowledge, they do not substantially advance the field or offer new insights beyond what is already well-established.</p> <p>2) No, "PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF LYMPH NODE METASTASES IN LARYNGAL CARCINOMA"</p> <p>3) No,</p> <p>4) results must be developed</p> <p>5) in the result sections, there some unclear results</p> <p>6) References are ancient and insufficient</p> <p>One of the primary reasons for not accepting this article is the insufficient methodology outlined in this manuscript. A robust methodology is essential for ensuring the validity and reliability of research findings. However, upon review, it became evident that the methodology presented in your manuscript lacks the necessary detail, clarity, or rigor required to support the conclusions drawn in your study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Absolutely not	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Yoldez Houcine
Department, University & Country	Salah Azeiz Institute, Tunisia