

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56913

Title: Complications of Acute Appendicitis: Impact of Delayed Presentation – A Retrospective Study

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality	✓			
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study

- **Relevance and Significance:** Addresses a critical issue in India, where delayed presentation impacts appendicitis outcomes, contributing valuable insights specific to a tier-2 setting.
- **Clear Objective:** The study aims to evaluate the spectrum of complications and their association with delayed presentation, which is well-defined.
- **Methodology:** Utilizes a retrospective observational design with clear operational definitions, contributing to reproducibility.
- **Data Analysis:** Appropriate statistical tools (chi-square, t-test, odds ratio) used to analyze associations.
- **Data Quality:** Based on actual hospital records, ensuring real-world relevance.
- **Clinical Impact:** Highlights the importance of early intervention to reduce morbidity, potentially informing health policies and referral systems.

Weaknesses of the Study

- **Sample Size:** Relatively small (n=100), which may limit the generalizability of the findings.
- **Single-Center Design:** Results may not be representative of broader populations.
- **Retrospective Nature:** Possibility of missing data and inherent biases.
- **Limited Demographic Data:** Lacks detailed socioeconomic and clinical information that could elucidate factors influencing delay.
- **Statistical Details:** Does not specify if multiple testing corrections were applied, and the confidence intervals for odds ratios are not provided.
- **Discussion Limitations:** The discussion could better compare findings with existing literature and explore underlying causes of delays.
- **Ethical Approval Details:** Although it is mentioned that ethical approval was obtained, specific approval protocol numbers are not provided.
- **Presentation and Language:** Minor typographical and grammatical inconsistencies are present, which could be improved.
- **Tables and Figures:** Tables are basic; inclusion of more detailed or graphical data visualization could clarify findings.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reviewer Comments

- **Title and Abstract:** The title accurately reflects the study focus but could be more concise. The abstract effectively summarizes purpose, methods, results, and conclusions; however, including specific statistical values or confidence intervals would strengthen it.
- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction provides sufficient background but could be more comprehensive regarding the global context of appendicitis complications. Clarify whether the aim is solely to assess complications or also to explore socioeconomic determinants.
- **Methodology and Statistical Analysis:** The retrospective design and operational definitions are appropriate. Nonetheless, further details on data collection procedures, handling of missing data, and justification for the cut-off of 48 hours would enhance transparency. Clarify whether sample size calculation was performed. Consider including univariate and multivariate analyses to control confounders.
- **Results and Discussion:** Results are well-organized; however, elaboration on demographic factors influencing delays is lacking. The discussion appropriately contextualizes findings but could compare with more recent or global data. Address potential confounders affecting the association between delays and complications.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusion is concise and relevant; emphasizing actionable steps such as public health awareness or referral pathways would enhance its utility.
- **Ethical Clearance:** Ethical approval is mentioned; including the approval number, date, and specific ethical standards would conform to scholarly standards.
- **Language and Formatting:** Minor grammatical errors are present, and language clarity can be improved with editing. Consistent formatting of references and tables would increase professionalism.
- **Figures and Tables:** More detailed or visual representations (e.g., bar graphs, flowcharts) could improve data comprehension.
- **References:** Appropriately cited; ensure all reference details follow a consistent style.