Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Surgery**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRS_124051**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Penile Strangulation – A Novel surgical procedure without cutting equipment**
Type of the Article	

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.	**This manuscript addresses a rare but critical medical emergency—penile strangulation—through a novel surgical procedure, contributing valuable knowledge to the urological field. The described technique, which avoids cutting equipment, offers a minimally invasive and effective solution to a life-threatening condition, emphasizing its potential to improve clinical outcomes in similar cases. The thorough case report, supported by clinical evidence and a detailed explanation of the procedure, can significantly aid surgeons in handling complex urological emergencies. I appreciate the manuscript's clarity and innovative approach, although additional data on long-term outcomes would enhance its scientific value further.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**The current title, "Penile Strangulation – A Novel Surgical Procedure Without Cutting Equipment," is clear and descriptive but could be more precise and engaging for a broader scientific audience. A more suitable title might be:** **"Non-Invasive Management of Penile Strangulation: A Novel Surgical Approach Without Cutting Tools"** **This alternative emphasizes both the non-invasive nature of the procedure and its innovative aspect, making it more appealing and informative.**	
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 is generally comprehensive, providing a clear overview of penile strangulation as a medical emergency, the cause, complications, and the novel surgical procedure performed.**	
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.	**This manuscript appears scientifically robust as it is based on a clearly defined case of penile strangulation, a rare but well-documented urological emergency. The authors provide a detailed explanation of the pathophysiology, supported by existing literature, which strengthens the scientific foundation of the report. The novel surgical technique described is technically sound, as it follows established medical principles for relieving pressure and restoring blood flow without the use of cutting equipment. Additionally, the outcome is clearly documented, demonstrating the procedure's success, further validating the approach's effectiveness and reproducibility.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	**Sufficient**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Utsav Anand Mani**
Department, University & Country	**SGPGIMS, India**