

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_105353
Title of the Manuscript:	Prospective Assessment of The Prognostic Value of Different Nutritional Assessment Scores on Short-term Outcome after Emergency colorectal surgery
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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/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>The article tried to study the prognostic value of some nutritional state related indicators like PNI, the CONUT score, and the NRI, which is beneficial for patients and improve their prognosis and life quality.</p> <p>The title is ok.</p> <p>The results part is not comprehensive.</p> <p>The manuscript structure is acceptable.</p> <p>While the study is roughly designed and lack of detailed investigation on the relations between the indicators and malnutrition and the prognosis, especially the results are not clearly enough described and unintelligible, also the clinical significance of these analysis should also be discussed when it is claimed as a "prospective assessment".</p> <p>The references are not sufficient, and some of them are too ancient like in 2004 and 2008.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language in this article is needed to be improved, too many grammar and format errors included should be corrected. I just picked up a few in the first page.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

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