

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_111113
Title of the Manuscript:	Laparoscopic Appendectomy in Complicated Appendicitis-Narrative review article
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1 The article is important however it should be cited somewhere there are few indications for conservative treatment in complicated appendicitis. 2 I suggest Complicated appendicitis – is still open surgery standard of care? 3. Abstract is comprehensive however I would change the order of the keywords. 4. Introduction is too long. I changed somethings but I suggest you to do a smaller one. The focus of the review is the discussion and there is some repeated information. 5. Yes. However I don't agree with some sentences written so I crossed the text. 6 References are sufficient and recent but not all references are cited in the text – for example “ Wang X, Zhang W, Yang X, Shao J, Zhou X, Yuan J. Complicated appendicitis in children: is laparoscopic appendectomy appropriate? A comparative study with the open appendectomy-our experience. J Pediatr Surg. 2009 Oct;44(10):1924–7. is not cited”. Also, references are not well made – there are many kind of references with different styles and some do not have the year of publication.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, there were some orthographic errors which I corrected.	
Optional/General comments	In separate is send a file with some suggestions. Most important of all there can't be a table not cited in the text.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eunice Vieira e Monteiro
Department, University & Country	Centro Hospitalar Póvoa de Varzim, Portugal