

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_121763
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Video-capsule Endoscopy in the etiological diagnosis of occult gastrointestinal bleeding
Type of the Article	Retrospective descriptive study

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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This retrospective study to evaluate the contribution of Video-capsule Endoscopy (VCE) in the etiological diagnosis of unexplained iron deficiency anemia is interesting. I would appreciate the work. This work is technically sound. Authors have reached definite outcomes which are based on your experiments.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title reflects the main hypothesis of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript. A core tip has been given which justifies the need for this study and is appreciable.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript describes the background, present status, and significance of the study. The manuscript describes methods in adequate detail. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. This work has been tailored with available literature. The figures are labelled properly. This is a descriptive study and thus the manuscript meets the requirements of biostatistics without any testing of hypothesis.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>It discusses the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented and the style, language, and grammar are accurate and appropriate. The author prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Heber Anandan
Department, University & Country	Dr. Agarwal's Eye Hospital, India