

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3210
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of possum scoring system in patients undergoing laparotomy
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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.	<p>The issue raised by the authors is pertinent; however, the manner in which the data are presented in the manuscript is not in accordance with my preferences. I am aware that a scientific paper has been previously published in a journal and can be published as a book chapter in an expanded form with the requisite copyright approval. Nevertheless, the published version of the book chapter, as well as the previously published article, did not employ statistical methods to analyse the results.</p> <p>The description of the statistical methods employed in the study, as well as the statistical analyses presented in the results section, lack sufficient detail and clarity. Please amend the manuscript and submit it for further review.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is apt.	
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.	<p>The article's abstract is not comprehensive due to the absence of statistical analysis of the data.</p> <p>Please amend the abstract of the manuscript and submit it for further consideration.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The structure and organisation of the manuscript are in accordance with the relevant academic standards. The literature sources used by the authors are outdated and it would be preferable to replace them with sources from the last five to ten years.</p> <p>Please amend the references in the manuscript and submit the revised version for further review.</p>	
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.	The manuscript is not in accordance with the established scientific standards due to the aforementioned reasons.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	A total of 154 patients were included in the study. Of the total number of patients, 65 (42.2%) underwent elective laparotomy, while 89 (57.8%) underwent laparotomy for emergency reasons. The analysis of such a limited number of patients does not permit the drawing of entirely conclusive inferences. In the discussion section, the authors merely present their findings without comparing them with those of other authors who have conducted similar studies. The identification of patients at high risk of complications and mortality will facilitate the implementation of appropriate and timely interventions, thereby enhancing the quality of patient management. In the Conclusions section, the authors correctly assert that POSSUM is one of the most effective scoring systems for predicting the	

[Review Form2](#)

	risk of morbidity and mortality with reasonable accuracy. The POSSUM system has been tested by numerous authors worldwide and has proven to be an effective tool for surgical audit. It offers clear benefits in terms of improving patient counselling, enhancing surgical outcomes in both emergency and elective departments, and more effectively managing limited resources and workforce. However, the rationale behind these assertions is not evident from the manuscript presented.	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is written in a manner that is appropriate for scientific communications in English.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Once the manuscript has been finalised, it may be published, taking into account the comments provided by the reviewers.	

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:	Igor A. Kryvoruchko
Department, University & Country	Kharkiv National Medical University, Ukraine