

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_128646
Title of the Manuscript:	Comprehensive Analysis of the Clinical Outcomes, Lifestyle Impacts, and Family Satisfaction in Hirschsprung's Disease: A Retrospective Cohort Study from a Single Pediatric Surgery Unit
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript might help to advance our understanding of Clinical Outcomes, quality of life of patients and Family Satisfaction in aganglionic mega colon. It can also provide valuable insights for Pediatric surgeons and other clinicians involved, improving patient care and outcomes. Furthermore, this can identify areas for further research in the field of Pediatric surgery.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Clinical outcomes, quality of life of patients and family satisfaction with Hirschsprung disease: A Retrospective Cohort Study from a Single Pediatric Surgery Unit	
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.	Can be kept as it is except keep topics in the new line including; introduction, methods, result, discussion, and conclusions	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference number 9,21, 32 were done 21 years back, as you are dealing with evolving subject and these are too old and less relevant. Other references are acceptable	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p># How many of your cases were having positive family history of HD? # One of your inclusion criteria is those cases having 1 year follow-up. Do you think 1 year follow up is sufficient? Why don't make it 2years, 3 years or 5 years? # What were the extent of the disease in your patients (ultrashort, short, long and total colonic aganglionosis) and what was the relationship between extent of the disease and functional outcome? #What were the types of Pull-through procedures (soave, Swenson, Duhamel....) performed in your patients? Was the type of specific surgical technique influence on functional outcomes? # According to your article HD is a newborn disease and majority (51%) of them undergo primary pull-through but the mean age at which they undergo the surgery is 10 months. Why? You diagnose them as a newborn and then you wait for 10 months to intervene or what? What is the upper age limit you avoid primary pull through and you opt for staged procedures? # Have you done analysis <u>age at time of pull-through</u> versus <u>clinical outcome (complications)</u>? # on postoperative complications: - 1. How many children died in the perioperative period and during follow-up? (inraop arrest, postoperative sepsis, malnutrition ...) 2. Though constipation is the most common condition following pull-through procedures, incontinence and soiling are the most feared complications. So, what was your finding regarding soiling and incontinence? What was your finding regarding post pull-through rectal prolapse? Perianal excoriation? Adhesion obstruction? were there patients with bladder dysfunction? # it is good if you explain something about Bowel function score (BFS) # Number of figures are too much some of them can be removed and some of them can be better explained by table. For example figure 1:- consanguineous and non- consanguineous marriages can be removed you already explained it in words well and that is enough. And some of the figures can be better explained by tables e.g figure 6: (The histogram illustrating the distribution of outcomes by gender and total cases. Each category shows the total cases, male and female cases for comparison, allowing for a clear visualization of the gender-specific impact across different outcomes.) # conclusion/ Lesson learnt part: - it needs rewriting, your conclusions must be with in your scope of study. You conclude from your study and findings not from somewhere else</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Nebiyu Shitaye</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia</p>