

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_127846
Title of the Manuscript:	Subcutaneous Wound Irrigation with Betadine Versus Normal Saline in Preventing Surgical Site Infections in Elective Surgeries: A Cross-Sectional Comparative Study
Type of the Article	Original research article

#### **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.	The subject is old and a lot of quality work has been done in this area. This manuscripts if not reproduced from another angle with a spark is just a repetition of what has already been published.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable	
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.	No, The abstract needs to be revised. Rewrite the Materials and methods; please mention briefly about sampling, data collection and statistical tests applied	revised
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No, The manuscript needs to be revised with major changes. The start is not relevant, subject of the paper is not clear. Importance of the subject and rationale of the study is not mentioned. Every part of the manuscript has major problems. Results are haphazard, discussion is not scientifically presented, and references are very old and not mentioned properly in text.	revised
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are only 11 references and most of them are 20-24 years old.	Latest references added

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The written communication need serious proof reading. The font style and size changes after every few lines with lack of punctuations. There is no connection between lines and sentences make no sense.</p>	<p>Times new roman 12 font of entire manuscript</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The author has not stated  <b>A) Conflict of interest disclosure</b>  <b>B) Funding sources acknowledgement</b>  <b>C) Competing interest issues</b></p> <p>Ethics approval</p> <p>Ethics approval was not required as this manuscript is a narrative review article.  <b>(These are the lines from the manuscript, mentioned at the end of conclusion. Although, ethical approval is mentioned for this study in the start and it is a cross-sectional study.</b>  <b>I haven't changed the font and style to keep it in its original form, There are many such examples in the manuscript, which I have highlighted on the original file)</b>  <b>There are only 11 references provided, but in text references are going up to 25. The sentences are copied from different articles along with their referencing style and numbering and even not edited later on and presented as such. Even the font style and size of different articles where the sentences are copied from have not been edited</b></p>	<p>Mentioned</p> <p>By mistake          Rewritten with proper latest references</p>

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> <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></p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p>No</p>