

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_118985</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>COLECTOMY IN CANCER PATIENTS: ANALYSIS OF SURGERY OUTCOMES IN A PRIVATE HOSPITAL IN THE NORTH OF BRAZIL</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, definitely. Today, there is an increasing trend in the incidence of colorectal cancer in the world, especially in certain regions of Brazil. In this manuscript the results of surgical treatment of colorectal cancer, early and late complications after surgery were analyzed. Most surgeons, even experienced ones, fear the anastomotic leakage.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes. But it should not contain abbreviations. The total number of patients is not indicated in the study design. It should be corrected.</p> <p>4. Yes. But there are no such subsections like: Acknowledgements, Competing Interests, Authors' Contributions, Consent.</p> <p>5. Yes, partially. But in the manuscript surgery outcomes were analyzed (its common knowledge), not the authors' own operative interventions. The level of early and late complications for one or another type of surgical intervention, depending on the surgical approach, is not specifically indicated. Only a short conclusion is available. I have doubts about the reliability of the data indicated in table No. 5.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and recent.</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>1. Yes, in general. There are some grammar mistakes and unfortunate stylistic turns. There are missing words in the text of the article. Abbreviations (CIDs, ANOVA, etc.) should be deciphered before submitting the abbreviated version.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. In subsection 2.2; 2.3 its necessary to indicate the total number of patients.</p> <p>2. In subsection 2.1, the word sequence at the beginning of the second sentence is incorrect.</p> <p>3. In section 3, paragraph 5, the numbers (%) of conventional and robot-assisted surgical interventions are incorrect. Although Table 1 contains the correct data.</p> <p>4. On page 4, in paragraph 2, there is an incorrect number – 953.5%.</p> <p>5. The total number of patients according to the staging of colorectal cancer does not correspond to 122 (119, 118) in tables 2 and 3.</p> <p>6. What were actually direct causes of death in deceased patients?</p> <p>7. In the last sentence on the page 6, I disagree with the statement: «In addition, recurrence was more common in patients subjected to left colectomy, which can be related to a greater number of stage III patients in the group», perhaps, it is related to the more frequent localization of the oncoprocess in the left half of the colon.</p> <p>8. In the article on the page 7 the duration of hospitalization for Videolaparoscopy operations was not indicated.</p> <p>9. Were there no complications during robot-assisted operations? I do not believe.</p> <p>10. I don't know the term «cross-sectional colectomy» on the 7-th page. May be its a wrong translation (<b>Transverse Colectomy</b>).</p> <p>11. In table 5, the name of the 3rd column should be not direct colectomy, but <b>right colectomy</b>.</p> <p>12. In my opinion, the last sentence in section 3 is incorrectly formed and doesn't clarify the concept of oncology in different interventions according to access.</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>Yevhen Shaprynskyi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Pirogov Memorial Medical University, Ukraine</b>