

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_125511
Title of the Manuscript:	Neonatal Hemorrhagic Syndrome Complicated by Orbital Hematoma.
Type of the Article	Case study

#### **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

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	Yes, the text is important for everyone, but especially for people who work in health care.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>Neonatal Hemorrhagic Syndrome: causes, diagnosis, and management.</b> <b>Neonatal Hemorrhagic Syndrome and Orbital Hematoma: Case study</b>	
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 of the article comprehensive	
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.	Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references were written without years of publisher, please rewrite all references	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### 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:	<b>Mohammed Talib Abed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Babylon, Iraq</b>