



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_48971</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Short term outcome of extracorporeal and Intracorporeal anastomosis in laparoscopic colorectal surgeries – A prospective observational study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This paper deals with an interesting subject for all operating surgeons. There are several flaws in the presentation of the study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The problem studied is analysed using very few patients causing serious bias influencing the findings.</li> <li>2. The text is too long and could be shortened down to half of its present length and deal with the studied problem only.</li> <li>3. The results are presented in median and standard deviations instead of median and range which is more appropriate when describing so few patients.</li> <li>4. The preoperative work up could be summarized in a table as well as the preoperative measures taken for the patient.</li> <li>5. The figures add nothing to clarify the issue studied. The figures can be omitted</li> <li>6. The use of decimals in the tables is unnecessary and should be omitted.</li> <li>7. A P value with more than two decimals is not serious when studying this small group of patients.</li> <li>8. The discussion section should be concentrated on discussing the results of the study only.</li> <li>9. The number of references should be reduced.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>Yes. Patients consent is not described. Information on ethical issues is missing.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Einar Arnbjörnsson</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Lund University Skåne University Hospital, Sweden</i></b>