

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 highlights the surgical approach for the surgical disease Pilonidal sinus. It also compares the surgical approaches to a chronic disease like pilonidal sinus in countries like Saudi Arabia.	
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.	The abstract is apt and comprehensive. It needs few corrections here & there....	
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.	The presentation of the manuscript is scientifically sound, as the way it has been explained with both tables & figures.....	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References cited are sufficient. Yet in the discussion part few references needed to be added to enhance the comparison of the results and discussion with other articles of similar presentation...	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes...But in certain areas Grammar check with rephrase of the sentences is needed.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, on looking at the submitted manuscript, it's quite okay. Corrections are to be made here and there to look impressive and acceptable.	

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:	Uthamalingam Murali
Department, University & Country	Manipal University College Malaysia, Malaysia