

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_126216
Title of the Manuscript:	Post Operative Chronic Pain After Mesh Fixation By Absorbable And Non Absorbable Suture In Lichtenstein Meshplasty
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	It is a good piece of work. The results could suggest an alternate choice of suture over conventional technique.	Ok
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes (But it would have been better if it revealed comparative nature of study between the two groups) (For eg., POST OPERATIVE CHRONIC PAIN AFTER MESH FIXATION BY ABSORBABLE VERSUS NON ABSORBABLE SUTURE IN LICHTENSTEIN MESHPLASTY- A COMPARATIVE STUDY)	This is an effective title
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 The methodology needs some clarifications- The timing of follow up is different in abstract and methods section (Abstract: Follow-up at discharge, 7 days, 1 month, and 3 months Methods section: at discharge and 3 months only) If follow up was also done at 1 month, was VAS, DN4 assessed? Analysis done?	Corrected all the minor mistakes
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 But again it needs some clarifications that have in highlighted and suggested in the reviewed manuscript file.	Checked
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs revision as suggested Discussion section: As the study aims to compare pain after mesh fixation in the two groups, it should focus more on this finding. Also try to give logical reasons how/why your results are similar or dissimilar to other studies	The paper has been updated.

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>	