

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_121704
Title of the Manuscript:	primary closure versus lay open surgery for pilonidal sinus in Saudi Arabia :25 years systematic review and meta-analysis.
Type of the 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.	This article shows a study comparison for a established techniques, although a new studies done on the established techniques should always be welcomed as it gives a chance to improve and to make GOOD A BETTER. Though a more detailed statistics could have been appreciated but overall this article is worth reading for knowledge and reference.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be more detailed as far as considered "lay open" words. In my personal opinion should give an standard MesH term or if non e are there than more elaborative title as "A comparison study between primary Vs secondary wound healing for Pilonidal sinus: post operative status" a suggestion only. Author can better make modification for this.	
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, need modifications. Result section says that Lay open technique have more recurrence rate, but in conclusion it is mentioned as less recurrence. A contradictory statement within abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES, INTRODUCTION : okay. Materials and Methods: well explained Results: Good Discussion: Many sentences and words especially" hospital stay and infection and recurrence" are repeated several times. Need avoid repetitions.	
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, a ggod metaanalysis for a research articles. This provides a framework for further studies to be done. Also guides a surgeon towards decision making.	
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 Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, as mentioned above. For authors review adding it here also. INTRODUCTION : okay. Materials and Methods: well explained Results: Good Discussion: Many sentences and words especially" hospital stay and infection and recurrence" are repeated several times. Need avoid repetitions.	
Optional/General comments	Please, avoid word and same sentence repetations. Article is having good analysis and showing hardwork of authors. Definitely it can be of a very helpful for reference for surgical decision making. I wish authours a good luck for this article publication.	

Review Form 3

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:	Maulik Kiranbhai Langaliya
Department, University & Country	Holy Spirit Hospital, India