

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_100034</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Efficacy of AI-Assisted CADe Systems in Colorectal Polyps and Adenomas During Colonoscopies: A Systematic Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original article</b>

### **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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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><b>Compulsory</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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, very interesting and important</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</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>It is approximately</p>					
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Please note the options which best describe your reaction to the Paper; extra detail can be written on the right of the form, on Reference the reverse, or prepare a separate report if you prefer.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1062 1367 1567 1717"> <p><b>1. ORIGINALITY: [ ]</b></p> <p>a. Never been done before</p> <p>b. Plagiarized content</p> <p>c. Minor variation on a known technique</p> <p>d. Re-invention of a known technique</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1567 1367 2264 1717"> <p><b>2.SIGNIFICANCE: [ ]</b></p> <p>a. Important problem of current interest</p> <p>b. Part of a problem of current interest</p> <p>c. An interesting insight</p> <p>d. Recreational</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1062 1717 1567 1883"> <p><b>3. DETAIL[ ]</b></p> <p>a. unnecessarily detailed</p> <p>b. Appropriate information provided</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1567 1717 2264 1883"> <p><b>4. REFERENCES[ ]</b></p> <p>a. Too many background references of marginal value</p> <p>b. virtually the same references the referee would have</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><b>1. ORIGINALITY: [ ]</b></p> <p>a. Never been done before</p> <p>b. Plagiarized content</p> <p>c. Minor variation on a known technique</p> <p>d. Re-invention of a known technique</p>	<p><b>2.SIGNIFICANCE: [ ]</b></p> <p>a. Important problem of current interest</p> <p>b. Part of a problem of current interest</p> <p>c. An interesting insight</p> <p>d. Recreational</p>	<p><b>3. DETAIL[ ]</b></p> <p>a. unnecessarily detailed</p> <p>b. Appropriate information provided</p>	<p><b>4. REFERENCES[ ]</b></p> <p>a. Too many background references of marginal value</p> <p>b. virtually the same references the referee would have</p>	
<p><b>1. ORIGINALITY: [ ]</b></p> <p>a. Never been done before</p> <p>b. Plagiarized content</p> <p>c. Minor variation on a known technique</p> <p>d. Re-invention of a known technique</p>	<p><b>2.SIGNIFICANCE: [ ]</b></p> <p>a. Important problem of current interest</p> <p>b. Part of a problem of current interest</p> <p>c. An interesting insight</p> <p>d. Recreational</p>					
<p><b>3. DETAIL[ ]</b></p> <p>a. unnecessarily detailed</p> <p>b. Appropriate information provided</p>	<p><b>4. REFERENCES[ ]</b></p> <p>a. Too many background references of marginal value</p> <p>b. virtually the same references the referee would have</p>					

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>c. Enough for the referee to repeat the work</p> <p>d. Reduce the details</p>	<p>cited</p> <p>c. Out-of-date references: to old work only</p> <p>d. shallow references: to new work only</p>	
	<p><b>5. RECOMMENDATION[ ]</b></p> <p>a. Accept as it is</p> <p>b. Minor revision</p> <p>c. Major revision</p> <p>d. What MUST be gone before acceptance?</p>		
<p><b>Comments to Author:</b></p> <p><b>Before acceptance the Manuscript: “Concepts that prevent inguinal hernia formation “</b>  <b>Please the authors to answer:</b></p> <p><b>1) how the authors have come to the conclusion that :</b></p> <p><b>Transversalis fascia does not have any role in the prevention of inguinal hernia formation,</b></p> <p><b>Aponeurotic extension in the posterior wall is the principle factor that prevents the inguinal hernia formation.</b></p> <p><b>2) is it scientifically proven ?</b></p>			

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nuhi Arslani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Uneverity of Maribor, Slovenia</b>