

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_126652
Title of the Manuscript:	Complicated peptic ulcer disease- An update on management: Narrative review article
Type of the Article	Narrative Review Article

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

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript provides a comprehensive review of complicated PUD management, offering valuable insights for gastroenterologists, surgeons, and clinicians. It highlights updated treatment approaches, including laparoscopic surgery, endoscopic techniques, and medical management, which remain critical despite advances in therapy. The content is scientifically robust and contributes meaningfully to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate as it clearly reflects the focus of the manuscript on management strategies for the complications of peptic ulcer disease. However, a slightly more specific title could enhance clarity, such as: "Updated Approaches in the Management of Complicated Peptic Ulcer Disease: A Comprehensive Review of Bleeding, Perforation, and Gastric Outlet Obstruction." or "Management of Complicated Peptic Ulcer Disease: Advances in Treatment of Bleeding, Perforation, and Gastric Outlet Obstruction" or "Updated Approaches to the Management of Complicated Peptic Ulcer Disease: A Focus on Bleeding, Perforation, and Obstruction" etc.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a good overview of the article's main topics, including the complications (bleeding, perforation, and gastric outlet obstruction) and management strategies (endoscopic and surgical). However, it would benefit from a more concise summary of the findings regarding recent trends and a clearer distinction between the individual treatment strategies for each complication. Additionally, including a brief mention of patient outcomes, such as morbidity and mortality trends, would help highlight the impact of current treatments.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and subsections of the manuscript are appropriate, with clear headings that guide the reader through the review logically. The use of separate sections for each complication (bleeding, perforation, and gastric outlet obstruction) ensures the manuscript is well-organized and easy to follow. The inclusion of relevant subheadings, such as "Management" and "Discussion," allows the scientific and clinical content to be easily accessible.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically sound and well-supported by current literature, incorporating established treatment protocols like endoscopic therapy for bleeding ulcers, laparoscopic surgery for perforations, and balloon dilation for gastric outlet obstruction. It references recognized clinical guidelines, such as those from the World Society of Emergency Surgeons, and discusses important scoring systems like Glasgow Blatchford and Rockall. Additionally, it highlights emerging trends in laparoscopic and endoscopic approaches. Overall, the manuscript is comprehensive, well-researched, and provides valuable insights for clinicians.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, suitable	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-organized and provides a clear overview of managing complicated peptic ulcer disease. However, it would benefit from a deeper focus on recent trends in laparoscopic and endoscopic treatments, as well as a brief discussion on patient outcomes (morbidity and mortality). Adding more recent studies or reviews could strengthen the evidence presented.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shashi Prakash
Department, University & Country	S. N. Medical College, India