

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_114395
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the outcome of surgery and radiotherapy in the treatment of early carcinoma of the larynx
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>The objective of this study was important. It compared the therapies and the outcomes. Besides the recurrence of the disease, the effect of procedure was also evaluated. This study stated that radiotherapy in treating laryngeal carcinoma made better outcome for speech and voice quality.</p> <p>The title was good. It explained the objective of the study in simple sentence.</p> <p>Overall, the abstract was in good structure. However, it needs to be revised since it had many mistypes.</p> <p>Written with a good flow and structure.</p> <p>I think you should evaluate the methods for statistical analysis. For example: Shapiro-wilk should be used when the number of patients is <50. If you want to write it that way, please provide references. If the methods were wrong, the results would be doubtful.</p> <p>All references were too old. Please use more articles which are < 10 years-old or more up-to-date.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Please consult with native or expert in English scientific writing to make the text better.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Many mistypes were seen. Please pay more attention.</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:	Lisnawati
Department, University & Country	University of Indonesia, Indonesia