

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_117161
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges of Temporary Stoma Creation – An Observational Study from a Tertiary Care Centre in Mumbai, India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript has a relative relevance to the scientific community. The title is suitable, even if “challenges” aren’t the focus of the text, the abstract is comprehensive, subsections are appropriate and the references sufficient. In the manuscript there is a huge lack on methodology: it is not stated the study period, the duration of follow-up, if data are retrospectively or prospectively collected, if the procedures are consecutives and if patient signed a consent form. Since the paper is about “temporary stomas”, it would be interest to define the term temporary in the introduction, where other references are needed for classification of stomas and their complications.</p> <p>Some indications for stoma creation should be further explained, such as cervical cancer. It is not immediate why a patient would need a stoma, even if it has been previously described. Table 6 shows complications in the “study population”, but the percentages are relative to the complicated patients only. Would be interesting having them both on the study population and the subgroup of complicated patients. Also is not clear if every patient had only one complications and how multiple ones are analysed. Table 7 shows how complications are managed; I suggest expanding on details of surgical management (which kind of surgery? Which timing?).</p> <p>To add relevance to the study would be interesting having a table comparing each indication with the kind of stoma used for that specific cause and the related complication. It would offer a more fascinating topic for discussion which is now mostly centred on comparison of measured data and the published ones.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The use of English in the manuscript isn’t perfect. I think it is fully understandable, but some terms aren’t used properly, and the structure of some sentences isn’t completely true to English language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luca Tirloni
Department, University & Country	University of Florence, Italy