

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_122947
Title of the Manuscript:	Cardiovascular Evaluation Before and After Splenectomy In β Thalassemia in Children
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.	I find this work interesting, although it has been demonstrated by several studies that splenectomy in polytransfused thalassemic patients reduces transfusion requirements and iron overload, but fewer studies have focused on overload and cardiac damage.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Yes, this study is technically sound given that splenectomy can be an alternative for these patients while waiting for a transplant.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	I find that the number of patients is very small and the duration of post-operative monitoring is also short to conclude.	

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:	Noumi Mustapha
Department, University & Country	Algiers