

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_94526
Title of the Manuscript:	Preoperative nutritional and anaesthetic management of patients undergoing digestive carcinolgy surgery
Type of the Article	No valorable

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Comment.</p> <p>The study should be ordered as described in the medical research protocols. An example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. <u>Summary. That includes introduction, objectives, material and method, results and conclusions.</u> 3. Subsequently, the Introduction is described with all the theoretical elements considered by the authors, with a brief description of the objectives of the study. 4. <u>Material and method. The type of study must be described, the time it was carried out, how the patients were included in the study, how the sample size was calculated and subsequently the statistical analysis.</u> 5. <u>Results. The anthropometric values of the patients, the study variables, and the results of the applied statistical analysis are described.</u> 6. <u>Discussion. The results obtained are contrasted with the bibliography that is being presented, in this section you must include all the tables and charts with their bibliographic support.</u> 7. <u>Conclusions. The final results and the limitations of the study that are considered are discussed.</u> 8. <u>Bibliography. This should appear in order of presentation and in the Introduction and Discussion sections. The format must be that of Vancouver.</u> <p>conclusions. In the way that the work is presented, an evaluation cannot be carried out. It is recommended to modify the format.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jose Luis Carranza Cortes
Department, University & Country	Mexico