

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_129174
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of adult male circumcision with circular stapler
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.	While the topic of the manuscript is relevant, its contribution to the scientific community appears limited due to its small sample size (only 20 patients), which raises concerns about the validity and generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the focus on the circular stapler lacks a broader comparison with existing methods, making it hard to assess its true superiority in practical or diverse clinical settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is overly simplistic and fails to convey the study's novelty or significance. It could be mistaken for a routine observational study, which undermines the impact of its findings. A more compelling title is necessary to draw attention and highlight the innovative aspects of the research.	
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 is poorly constructed, riddled with grammatical errors, and lacks depth. For instance, the objectives and results are presented without context, making it hard for readers to grasp the relevance of the findings. It also fails to address the study's limitations, which would be critical for an honest and transparent summary of the work.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The study does not provide sufficient evidence to support its claims of superiority for the circular stapler. The statistical analysis is shallow and lacks detailed explanation, which weakens the manuscript's credibility. Moreover, the small sample size is a glaring issue that severely limits the statistical power and applicability of the results. The study design lacks rigorous controls, making the conclusions overly optimistic and potentially misleading.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references section is inadequate and outdated in parts, missing key recent studies that could provide a more comprehensive comparison with other circumcision techniques. For a study claiming innovation, it is unacceptable to ignore critical research on the Shang Ring, other stapler-based devices,	

Review Form 3

	or global trends in circumcision. Adding these references is essential for grounding the work in a broader scientific context.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is poor, with numerous grammatical mistakes, awkward phrasing, and lack of scholarly tone. For example, phrases like "Male circumcision consist..." reflect basic grammatical oversights, which is unacceptable in an academic paper. The writing is unrefined and requires professional editing to make it suitable for publication. The overall tone lacks precision and clarity, leaving readers frustrated and disengaged.	
Optional/General comments	The issues are more substantial than minor revisions can address. While the manuscript presents novel findings, its execution and presentation need significant improvement.	

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:	Muhammad Sobri Maulana
Department, University & Country	Indonesia