

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_99354
Title of the Manuscript:	Initiating Gastrointestinal Endoscopy : Experience from a semi-urban population
Type of the Article	

### 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Since there is lack of epidemiological data from SubSaharan Africa Studies are welcomed</p> <p>More proper “ Gastrointestinal endoscopy findings in a sub-urban population in South-East Nigeria during a 2.5 year period after endoscopy introduction”.</p> <p>The abstract should contain data from the results The main findings are more useful than comments, the former should be left for main document discussion</p> <p>The results section is too poor. The authors should provide more details about their findings It might be more useful to present findings per year or semester of endoscopy operation. In such a way the timely trend would appear. Gastritis is a histologic not endoscopic finding Thus it should be avoided as diagnosis. Histology findings are also interesting to be presented if available. Also, it might be interesting to separately presented emergency or cases with alarming symptoms and endoscopies without alarming symptoms.</p> <p>The authors should explain in what depth they have investigated cases Diagnoses such as achalasia, GIST have been based on manometry and histology and/or EUS? Did the authors investigate oesophageal and pyloric stenosis and what were the results? Was there any eosinophilic esophagitis?</p> <p>Gallaher JR, et al. The role of endoscopy after upper gastrointestinal bleeding in sub-Saharan Africa: A prospective observational cohort study. <i>Malawi Medical Journal</i> 2020;32: 139-145.</p> <p>Bhat P, et al. Promotion of gastrointestinal endoscopy in Sub-Saharan Africa: What is needed, and how can ESGE and WEO help? <i>Endosc Int Open</i>. 2021; 9: E1001–E1003.</p> <p>Qureshi JS, et al. Epidemiology of Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding in a Sub Saharan African Tertiary Hospital. <i>JSR</i> 2014;186:553</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language needs polishing It is better use simpler expressions than use words that donot fit in the text</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>As well as the authors would expand their results session the discussion should follow</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Panagiotis Tsibouris</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>NIMTS General Hospital, Greece</b>