

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
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

	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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></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, CRC, NSAID, CEA, CT, MRI, PET-CT, 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 cite recent prevalence or incidence data about colorectal cancer and it should be at-least of 2022 or 2023 since the authors cited upto 2020 and 2021 only.</p> <p>3. When referring to SPSS versions beginning from 19, authors should cite 'IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 20 (IBM Corp., Armonk, N.Y., USA)'.</p> <p>4. 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>5. The limitation of the present investigation and future direction may be given along with conclusion or under separate heading for understanding the concepts clearly.</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 "is third" may be as "is the third"; "patients of" as "patients with"; "malignancy in" as "malignancy were in"; "the females" as "females"; "19.6% patients" as "19.6% of patients"; "smoking" as "a smoking"; "3.5% patients" as "3.5% of patients"; "positive" as "a positive"; "Highest" as "The highest"; "Majority" as "The majority"; "study priod" as "the study period"; "trend" as "a trend"; "of high risk" as "high-risk"; "and the" as "and is the"; "per cancer" as "per the cancer"; "The colorectal" as "Colorectal"; "higher" as "a higher"; "highest" as "the highest"; "virtual" as " , and virtual"; "burden of disease" as "the burden of the disease"; "Department" as "the Department"; "with diagnosis" as "with a diagnosis"; "Patients of" as "Patients with"; "stratification done" as "stratification is done"; "Modified" as "the Modified"; "History" as "A history"; "the bleeding" as "bleeding"; " , altered" as " , and altered"; "duration" as "the duration"; " , proctoscopic" as " , and proctoscopic"; "was lower" as "lower"; "taken in" as "taken into"; "histopathological" as "the histopathological"; "composed of" as "is composed of"; "location" as "the location"; "anal" as "the</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>anal"; "having diagnosis" as "as having a diagnosis"; "management was" as "management were"; "in 56 patients of" as "from 56 patients with"; "mean" as "a mean"; "There were" as "There was"; "is AYA" as "is the AYA"; "Majority" as "The majority"; "addiction" as "an addiction"; "5.3% cases" as "5.3% of cases"; "patients of" as "patients with"; "the 56" as "56"; "of study" as "of the study"; "and following" as "and the following"; "Highest" as "The highest"; "had lesion" as "had a lesion"; "in hepatic" as "in the hepatic"; "in splenic" as "in the splenic"; "of location" as "of the location"; "Maximum" as "The maximum"; "same have" as "same has"; "FOLFOX" as "a FOLFOX"; "FOLFIRI" as "the FOLFIRI"; "CAPOX" as "the CAPOX"; "be rectum" as "be the rectum"; "with most" as "with the most"; "in maximum" as "in a maximum". The 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 "malignancies" may be as "malignancy"; "first degree" as "first-degree"; "second degree" as "second-degree"; "Non-mucin secreting" as "Non-mucin-secreting"; "mucin secreting" as "mucin-secreting"; "well differentiated" as "well-differentiated"; "shows" as "show"; "Key words" as "Keywords"; "Non modifiable" as "Non-modifiable"; "non polyposis" as "non-polyposis"; "long term" as "long-term"; "NSAIDs" as "NSAIDs"; "socioeconomical" as "socioeconomic"; "occult bleed" as "occult bleeding"; "Right sided" as "Right-sided"; "left sided" as "left-sided"; "well written" as "well-written"; "Patient whose" as "Patients whose"; "conducted varying" as "conducted vary"; "specimen were" as "specimens were"; "Well differentiated" as "Well-differentiated"; "showing signet" as "shows signet"; "depending on" as "depends on"; "chemo radiation" as "chemoradiation"; "Various regimen" as "Various regimens"; "Chi square" as "Chi-square"; "fifty six" as "fifty-six"; "p value" as "p-value"; "circumferencial" as "circumferential"; "neo adjuvant" as "neo-adjuvant"; "post surgery" as "post-surgery"; "first line" as "first-line"; "post surgical" as "post-surgical"; "with sign" as "with signs"; "high risk" as "high-risk". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors have put effort to evaluate the "The study of epidemiology, clinicopathology and current management in patients of colorectal malignancies in northern India". 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. Hence, the paper can be accepted after MINOR REVISIONS are carried out.</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>