

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetricsc
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	

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 study titled "Subcutaneous Wound Irrigation with Betadine Versus Normal Saline in Preventing Surgical Site Infections in Elective Surgeries: A Cross-Sectional Comparative Study" holds significant scientific importance for several reasons. Firstly, surgical site infections (SSIs) are common and serious complications that can lead to adverse outcomes and increased healthcare costs. This research aims to evaluate effective methods for reducing these infections. Secondly, by comparing the efficacy of Betadine and normal saline as wound irrigation solutions, the study provides valuable insights that can aid healthcare professionals in selecting the most effective approach for infection prevention. Furthermore, the findings may contribute to the enhancement of surgical protocols, ultimately improving patient care and outcomes. Lastly, this study could pave the way for further research in wound irrigation and infection prevention, deepening our understanding of the impacts of various antiseptic agents.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is better to use the word "Effect" at the beginning of the title. "The Effect of Subcutaneous Wound Irrigation with Betadine Versus Normal Saline in Preventing Surgical Site Infections in Elective Surgeries: A Cross-Sectional Comparative Study"	
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 the showcase of your article, please reform it. In the method section of the abstract, after you have mentioned the Design of article, the section referring to receiving the code of ethics should be removed from this section. Please mention the time period of the study and the location of the study. The sample size and sampling method should be mentioned. The method of data analysis with what software was used should be mentioned. Also, the conclusion section only mentioned the main result of the study, the application of this result in society and the recommendation for using this protocol should be mentioned. Also, the keywords of your study are not mentioned at all, please mention them based on the mesh.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The introduction section should be revised and fully explained regarding the importance of the topic and statistics incidence of surgical wound infections in the world, as well as the methods of preventing these wounds that have led to a reduction in the rate of surgical wound infections. The method section should be explained more fully and precisely. Also, the discussion of the article should be increased to 1000 words. The conclusion section should be rewritten. At the end of the discussion, the limitations of the study and suggestions for further research should be explained.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1)The number of references is very few, with only 11 references cited, 4 of which are from 2015 or later. Please increase and update the number of references, emphasizing that references from the last 5 years be used more. 2) The reference numbers should be corrected in the text of the article.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is good.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mehrangiz Ghabimi
Department, University & Country	Birjand University of Medical Sciences, Iran