

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_127596
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Malignant Retro Rectal Tumor: Two Compelling Case Reports</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> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors of the manuscript "Malignant Retro Rectal Tumor: Two Compelling Case Reports" have made an excellent presentation. However, they should give a more detailed and precise explanation why they preferred the perineal approach in case 1 because a 7x7cm retrorectal tumor is a large tumor that can be treated more safely via the abdominal approach.	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Antonios-Apostolos Tentis</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>EUROMEDICA Kyanous Stavros, Greece</b>