

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_103674
Title of the Manuscript:	Robotic colorectal surgery: a single tertiary care experience
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the commentary written satisfactorily.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Recent references may be included.</p> <p>1. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the abstract and the remaining for the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, BMI, American Society of Anaesthesiology (ASA), etc.). Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words to be abbreviated.</p> <p>2. The authors may improve the discussion of their results by focusing on the present findings and introducing data from other authors who also worked with the same or other studies with recent references since it is lack of sufficient references.</p> <p>3. The conclusion seems in general. All conclusions must be convincing statements on what was found to be novel, impact based on the strong support of the data/results/discussion. Moreover, the authors may also be included the limitation of the present findings for a better understanding of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "above age" may be as "above the age"; "P-value" as "a p-value"; "lower" as "with lower"; "safe" as "a safe"; "reduced" as "a reduced"; ", better" as ", and better"; "to next" as "to the next"; "more advances" as "advances"; "to drastic" as "to a drastic"; "is paired" as "paired"; "carried in" as "carried out in"; "widw" as "a widw"; "advanced" as "of advanced"; "with number" as "with a number"; "dissected" as "was dissected"; "most" as "the most"; "was given" as "given"; "carried by" as "carried out by"; "standardised" as "the standardised"; "recover of" as "recover"; "Data was" as "Data were"; "with male" as "with the male"; "past few" as "the past few"; "an enormous gestures" as "an enormous gesture or enormous gestures"; "there are no" as "there is no"; "preferable than" as "preferable to"; "on feasibility" as "into the feasibility"; "Robotic" as "the Robotic"; "approach of" as "approach to"; "mean age" as "the mean age"; ", neoadjuvant" as ", and neoadjuvant"; "Most" as "The most"; "Study" as "The study"; "following" as "the following"; "most number" as "the most numbers"; "with mean" as "with a mean"; "P value" as "a p-value"; "with BMI" as "with a BMI"; "having mean" as "having the mean"; "treatment 270" as "treatment at 270"; "surgery 212" as "surgery at 212"; "like reduced" as "like a reduced"; "a better" as "better"; "with wide" as "with a wide"; "of surgical" as "of the surgical"; "endeavored to" as "endeavored for". The</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words "cosmesis.." may be as "cosmesis."; "adenocarcinoma" as "adenocarcinoma"; "specialties" as "specialities"; "a reported" as "a report"; "undervent" as "underwent"; "institute" as "Institute"; "advaced" as "advanced"; "percedures" as "procedures"; "in this study" as "In this study,"; "january" as "January"; "june" as "June"; "resukting" as "resulting"; "anantomotic" as "anastomotic"; "whole body" as "whole-body"; "chnaging" as "changing"; "mangement" as "management"; "abd" as "check seplling"; "Statiscal" as "Statistical"; "clearance" as "clearance"; "its a n" as "it's an"; "american society of anaesthesiology" as "American Society of Anaesthesiology"; "retreival" as "retrieval"; "Nmber" as "Number"; "Post operative" as "Post-operative"; "retreived" as "retrieved"; "surgerons" as "surgeons"; "the a" as "the"; "humen" as "human"; "days best" as "day's best"; "study we" as "study, we"; "institute of medical science" as "Institute of Medical Science"; "performes" as "performs"; "predominence" as "predominance"; "permenent" as "permanent"; "resevition" as "resection"; "conversion" as "conversion"; "resultsd" as "results"; "leeds" as "leads". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p>	
<p>Optional/Generalcomments</p>	<p>The authors have put effort to evaluate the "Robotic colorectal surgery: a single tertiary care experience". The authors describe the results undertaken with this in an organized manner, emphasizing the results obtained by them. The article needs modification for better cohesion of information to achieve the goal and the shortcomings which need to be considered.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>A. Vijaya Anand</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bharathiar University, India</p>