

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_105961
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Validation of a Mobile Application for Predicting the Risk of Anastomotic Leakage in Patients Operated for the Treatment of Colorectal Cancer
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. As the anastomotic leakage is still the most devastating complication from both a oncological and surgical point of view, which affects the treatment outcome including worsening the prognosis of disease. Therefore the manuscript topic is important and scientific.</p> <p>2. The title is ok.</p> <p>3. The article abstract is comprehensive according to its core purpose.</p> <p>4. These parts are appropriate for the article.</p> <p>5. Especially AL has a key part in patients prognosis, it is important to study it in clinic, up to now, there are many studies focus on its predictive markers, while still an effective evaluation system is missing, this article was prompted under the high development of AI and mobile device, attempting to integrate AL risk markers into a mobile app. The author also mentioned in the article that there are similar products which barely been used. The basic reason for this in my view is the correction of these markers in predicting AL, which the author should also demonstrate the advanced technology and accuracy of all indexed chosen in the app firstly. In total, this work is encouraged.</p> <p>6. It is better to have more references involving in AL risk factors.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language is acceptable except a few format errors, such as two consequent spaces.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Although the work is not so able to demonstrate its advance while it is a small try in such aspects.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yun Deng
Department, University & Country	Shanghai Cancer Center, Fudan University, China