

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_103654
Title of the Manuscript:	The study of epidemiology, clinicopathology and current management in patients of colorectal malignancies in northern India
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.journalajrrga.com/index.php/AJRRGA/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>-Yes , The manuscript is important in scientific community</p> <p>2-Yes , it is good and suitable title</p> <p>3-Yes , the abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4-Yes, they are good</p> <p>5- yes manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6- yes</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>There are many problems with publishing this paper.</p> <p>1- Word of ((Period)) in abstract (part of result in abstract) should be written period instead of Period</p> <p>2- Word of ((diagnosis)) in part of Observations and results should be written diagnosis instead of diagnosis</p> <p>3- Word of ((circumferential)) in part of Observations and results should be written circumferential</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ahmed Samy El-Shafey</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tanta University, Egypt</b>