

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJRRGA_95360   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Stoma and Shame: Patient's Dignity in Danger              |
| Type of the Article      | Commentary  |

### 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.journalajrrga.com/index.php/AJRRGA/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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>Comments for authors and editorial teams::<br/>The study entitled "<b>Stoma and Shame: Patient's Dignity in Danger</b>" is novel and interesting. However, some minor concerns should be considered to improve the novelty as well as the flow of the manuscript:</p> <p>1- Abstract: Acceptable<br/>2- Keywords: Acceptable<br/>3- Introduction: Acceptable<br/>4- Methodology: Acceptable but I could not see informed census and also ethical code.<br/>5- Results: Acceptable<br/>6- Discussion: Could be scientifically than present.<br/>7- Bibliography/References: : Acceptable<br/>8- I could not see running title, informed census, ethical code, funding support <b>declaration</b> and acknowledgment in manuscript. All of these compulsory.</p> <p><b>Final decision: Manuscript is acceptable for publication after minor correction</b></p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | Informed census and also ethical code should be included.   |   |

### 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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                                |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Name:                            | Kazemi A                       |
| Department, University & Country | Tabriz Uni. of Med. Sci., Iran |