

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_130333 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | PATIENT-RELATED FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE SSIS AMONG POST LAPAROTOMY PATIENTS IN THE SURGICAL UNIT AT THIKA LEVEL 5 HOSPITAL KIAMBU COUNTY |
| Type of the 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: 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. | | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative 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. | | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | <p>Your study has the potential to address an important clinical issue and contribute to the literature. However, there are currently some shortcomings and aspects that need to be changed. Among these, I have indicated strong growth and points that need to be developed:</p> <p><i>1. Methodology Section is Incomplete</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The study design is unclear. Is it retrospective or prospective? This should be specified.• The inclusion and exclusion criteria for the patients need to be clearly stated.• There is no mention of ethical approval for the study. This information must be included. <p><i>2. Discussion of Results is Weak</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Your findings are not compared with other studies. Explain why your results are similar to or different from previous studies.• Discuss the limitations of your study. For example, is it a single-center study? Was the sample size adequate? <p><i>3. Language and Structure Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sentences are too long and complicated. Use shorter and clearer sentences. <p><i>4. Conclusion and Recommendations are Insufficient</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summarize the most significant findings of your study more clearly.• Offer more actionable recommendations for healthcare professionals or hospitals. <p>This manuscript requires a major revision because there are significant issues in the methodology, discussion, and conclusion sections.</p> | <p>Effected revision</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Revision made</p> <p>Done revision</p> |

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) | |