

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
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

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.	Though most common, it is interesting it is a rare presentation of HDN.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Write as a rare presentation of HDN..... A Case Report /HDN prevention as.....	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, better to change as per guidelines.	
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.	A good and interesting case, but better to improve with presentation. Better to write discussion, better to write proper history ?Is it SVD? Compare with similar studies. Uniqueness? Please follow proper guidelines.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No not proper better to write as per guide lines	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	To be improved	
Optional/General comments	Interesting case report, Keywords better to be MeSH terms, in an alphabetical order. Any MRI /CT image better to add.	

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:	Rakesh kotha
Department, University & Country	Osmania medical college, India