

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_122803
Title of the Manuscript:	The Current status of Open inguinal hernia repair in Adults: Narrative Review article
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript 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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>The Editor AJMAH</p> <p>Review of article on Current status of Open inguinal hernia repair</p> <p>Dear Sir / Ma'am, The article gives some statements regarding different inguinal hernia repairs. My comments on the article are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There is no defined aim of the article. Does the author want to compare different methods? There is no consistency or direct comparison of different methods.2. Same statements are repeated at different places, such as introduction, body and conclusion. This is unnecessary and actually distracts from the article.3. Systematic reviews are available on the subject, hence I fail to see reason for a narrative review.4. Some methods, like PHS and McVay repair now belong to history hence there does not seem to be reason for its inclusion. Conversely, classical Bassini is rarely performed nowadays, and it's modifications are not mentioned.5. There should be a table comparing the outcomes of different methods, for the reader to benefit.6. The article appears to be an abstract from the review of literature of a thesis. It lacks coherence. Statements are taken from different articles and added to text.7. In its current form I fail to see any advantage to the serious reader. <p>My recommendation is : Reject</p> <p>Rajdeep Singh</p>	

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:	Rajdeep Singh
Department, University & Country	Lok Nayak Hospital, India