

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_122342
Title of the Manuscript:	A Case report and review of literature of a giant lipoma of the hand
Type of the Article	Case report

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 plays a significant role in advancing scientific knowledge within the community by addressing a gap in current research, offering novel insights, and potentially influencing future studies and clinical practices. Its contribution to the scientific community lies in its ability to stimulate critical thinking, provoke discussions amongst researchers, and provide a foundation for further investigations in the field. Personally, I appreciate this manuscript for its innovative approach, thorough analysis, and potential to impact the scientific landscape positively, making it a valuable addition to scholarly literature.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article seems appropriate.	
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 summary of the article is comprehensive and does not require any modification.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it seems appropriate.	
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 demonstrates scientific correctness through its meticulous methodology, adherence to established scientific principles, and comprehensive analysis of data. Its robustness is evident in the rigorous experimental design, thorough literature review, and logical interpretation of results. The technical soundness of the manuscript is exemplified by the precise instrumentation used, the attention to detail in data collection and analysis, and the clear presentation of findings. Overall, the manuscript's scientific integrity, methodological rigor, and technical proficiency substantiate its credibility and contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references seem current and adequate.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is suitable for academic communication.	
Optional/General comments	Nothing.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasan Haydar
Department, University & Country	Hama University, Syria