

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_120952</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Multidisciplinary Management of a Rare Gastrocolic Fistula Secondary to Gastric Cancer: A Case Report and Literature Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Very interesting case I disagree with the surgical management This cases must be managed in a minimally invasive way by expert endoscopist and interventional radiologist in case of failure	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Well written article	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I thing that this is the wrong way to manage this case of patient Surgery for palliative care is the last option after minimally invasive failure and it's never the first choice	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are ok	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	We are living an era in wich endoscopic therapy is very advanced and cases like this could be managed by endoscopic palliation sharing therapy with interventional radiologists in a minimally invasive way. There are endoscopic devices for fistulas closure (Over the Scope Clip, X-track and sutuArt, vacuum therapy by self expandible metallic stent, three lumen naso jejunal tube, e.g.) and the possibility to perform Gastro Entero Anastomosis (GEA) by LAMS deployment under Echoendoscopic guidance and only after endoscopic closure failure you may treat this case surgically	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Marco Gentile</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>IRCCS Casa Sollievo Della Sofferenza, Italy</b>