

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_125081
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Stump appendicitis: An update on current management- Narrative review article</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>-The article is presented in the format of a brief review. While the subject of stump appendicitis is addressed in a cursory manner, it is evident that the authors have invested a considerable amount of effort.</p> <p>-The article would benefit from a more rigorous proofreading to improve its English language level. The use of long sentences, in particular, impairs coherence. The sentences should be shortened to remove ambiguity. (Conservative treatment has been proposed in the management of stump appendicitis, where the patients is started on intra-venous antibiotics and intra-venous fluids and an elective interval stump appendectomy is than performed in eight weeks' time)</p> <p>-The article did not employ any abbreviations (computerised tomography (CT)). The same sentence is repeated (open or laparoscopic procedure). In the case of an appendectomy, it would be sufficient to provide a preference for an open surgical technique in the introduction section. It will not be necessary to reiterate this information in other sections.</p> <p>- A number of other sentences in the article employ a similar structure. A more academic language should be employed (For cases of stump appendicitis where the base is compromised) . The term 'radix' would have been a more appropriate choice.</p> <p>-It is imperative that the data presented in an original medical article undergo statistical filtering. The article is deficient in terms of both tabular and graphical representation. It would have been preferable for a separate column to have been included in Table 1 for the number of patients included in the studies, in addition to the existing column for appendicular stump length.</p> <p>-It would have been beneficial for the Discussion section to include a summary of the important complications and outcomes reported by the studies mentioned, as this would have enabled readers to anticipate the potential clinical scenarios they might encounter following stump appendectomy.</p> <p>-It is recommended that the sentence patterns of the Conclusion section be reconsidered and that the level of English be reviewed once more.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Not enough. Further elaboration of the issue is required.</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically</b></p>	<p>-It would be beneficial to provide a more robust discussion section in the article. It is essential to disseminate the principal complications and implications of the available studies. In the event that a tabular presentation of the data is required, this should be provided.</p>	

### Review Form 3

<b>robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	-It would have been beneficial to include 'duplicate appendicitis' and 'cecal diverticulum' in the differential diagnosis of stump appendicitis.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	As previously stated, it is imperative that this matter be subjected to further deliberation and analysis.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is of the utmost importance that the authors undertake significant revisions to the article.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ahmet Baris Dirim</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Health Sciences University, Adana City Training and Research Hospital, Turkey</b>