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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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. 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.****-** |  |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? |  |  |
| Optional/General comments | **1.Strengths**- Wide-ranging review of clinical scoring systems, inflammatory markers, imaging modalities, and laparoscopic surgery in reducing NAR (1996-2024)- Recent literature covers systematic reviews and meta-analyses, plus regional differences.- Multimodal approach integrates clinical, biochemical, radiological and surgical approaches to diagnosis.2. **Weaknesses & Critique:**a) Lack of Methodological Rigor for a Review:- Article lacks structured methodology (e.g. PRISMA flowchart, inclusion/exclusion criteria, quality assessment).- No data on number of articles reviewed or how data was extracted/synthesised.b) Outdated or Inconsistent Definitions:- Definition of negative appendectomy inconsistent. While histopathology cited as gold standard, some parts refer to intraoperative appearance, which is outdated and prone to surgeon bias.- Current literature supports histopathologic confirmation as definitive criterion (Bhangu et al., 2015; Andersson, 2007).c) Underemphasis on Diagnostic Pathways:- Paper misses recent guidelines recommending diagnostic pathways combining scoring systems + ultrasound + CT selectively, e.g. World Society of Emergency Surgery (WSES) guidelines (Di Saverio et al., 2020).- Low-dose CT and MRI absent despite growing role in reducing NAR with minimized radiation exposure in children and pregnant women (Kim et al., 2018).d) Gender-Specific Considerations Not Explored Deeply:- It notes that women have higher NARs but fails to critically analyse gynaecological differential diagnoses or the role of gynaecological ultrasound in females of reproductive age.e) No Discussion on Non-Operative Management:- Emerging strategies for uncomplicated appendicitis, which could impact NAR, are not discussed (CODA Trial, 2020).f) Redundancy and Language Issues:- Several parts of the article are repetitive.- Grammar, punctuation and syntax need improvement to enhance clarity and readability.**3. Conclusion:**While informative and broad in scope, this review would benefit from greater methodological rigor, structured presentation, and deeper engagement with evolving trends like diagnostic algorithms, non-surgical management, and gender-specific challenges. Inclusion of more recent international consensus guidelines and refinement of definitions would also increase its academic quality. |  |
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