

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75821
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on the Clinicopathological Profile of the cases of Colorectal Carcinoma
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p><i>Abstract (sub-heading 'Place and duration of study')</i> I get to understand that the duration when the data was processed and manuscript was prepared is mentioned here. I'd suggest to revise this line as it may confuse the reader with the time mentioned in the 'Study design' sub-heading above.</p> <p><i>Abstract (sub-heading 'Results')</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please make the letters of the sub-heading bold, for uniformity. • 'The mean of the patients' should be 'The mean age of the patients' • 'most common tumour site was rectal carcinoma' - consider grammatical correction • 'most common histological differentiation was moderately differentiated tumours' - consider grammatical correction <p><i>Abstract (sub-heading 'Conclusion')</i> 'mat be attributable' should be 'maybe attributable'</p> <p><i>Keywords</i> Consider revision of keywords 'incidence', 'India' to be a little more specific, because these words might not help the audience find the article.</p> <p><i>Materials and methods</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Saveetha medical College' should be 'Saveetha Medical College' • 'The benign tumours of colon and rectum were not included in the study' - consider revising this sentence. Exclusion criteria, if any, should be a subset of the included population. • 'analysed using statistical software' - kindly mention what statistical tests were done. <p><i>Results and discussion</i> <i>Adenocarcinoma, mucinous adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma</i> - I'd suggest using the word 'conventional' before the first adenocarcinoma, for better comprehensibility.</p> <p>In regards to diagnosis of poorly diagnosed adenocarcinoma, how was the diagnosis confirmed? Was it with morphology alone? Was any ancillary technique used, i.e., such as immunohistochemistry. Kindly mention this in the 'methods' or 'results' section.</p> <p>'Although India is relatively low on the incidence rates when compared to western countries, a rise in colorectal cancer incidence among young adults has been noted in various studies' – this line is contradicting with the line mentioned in the Conclusion part of the Abstract – 'The increased incidence in younger patients as compared to previous studies...'. Consider revising the sentences.</p> <p>'...showing a decrease in the mean age in 2018 and 2019 when compared to 2017' – kindly mention the 'p-value' or other measure of statistical significance. Kindly explain how this interpretation from a study of 51 cases was extrapolated to bigger populations.</p> <p><i>Overall</i> Kindly maintain font design uniformity (bold/italics) through-out and correct the spelling and punctuation errors.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p><i>Tables</i> Consider clubbing of tables or reducing their number by replacing them with text. For example, the table which mentions the procedure underwent by the patient to obtain specimen.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<i>Overall</i> Consider improving sentence structure and formation	
Optional/General comments	<i>Title</i> I'd suggest to make the title a little catchier. One suggestion is to use the study conclusion that there is an increased incidence in younger population in the title. The study is mentioned to be clinicopathological. Were there any significant changes in blood chemistry or changes in complete blood count parameters that would be worth inclusion? Were there any assays of tumour markers done in these patients? Consider including a sentence on limitations of the study. Can any suggestions be made in the 'Conclusion' part for future research, for instance, a larger study population, or a wider study duration or a correlation with any particular demographic factor or clinicopathological parameter?	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Naveenvairamoorthy Dakshinamoorthy
Department, University & Country	ESI Postgraduate Institute of Medical Science and Research, India