

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_116579
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of The Failure Rates of Sustainable Weight Loss after Sleeve Gastrectomy: Systematic Review
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

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>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>Yes, because failure of sustainable weight loss is a real challenge for bariatric surgeons especially after sleeve gastrectomy.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>References are sufficient but not recent for example; the first 2 references used in introduction are since 2014 and 2010 respectively. Moreover, reference number 5 is since 2006.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. But there are some few comments.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In abstract: in the sixth line part patients is wrong instead of it will be part of patients.</p> <p>In selection criteria: the first black circle before we examined should be removed and bullets or numbering stats from the second line.</p> <p>In discussion: in the seventh line we should remove the word (your)to be just achieving a weight loss of 5% or 10% of starting body weight because it seems that you are talking to a specific patient not in research language.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Ahmed EL-Gelany Azab
Department, University & Country	Cairo University, Egypt