



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_36617
Title of the Manuscript:	Pathological study of colorectal cancer in Missan province
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://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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1- In abstract section. There is an incompatibility between results and abstract. 2- There is a numerous of sentence existing in the introduction section but the aim of the research was not specified. 3- Data collection method (prospective or retrospective, randomization?) is not specified, 4- There is no information about ethical consent 5- Type of surgery, T and N stage of the patients, follow up period and data are not available in the text. 6- Minor grammar and punctuation issues throughout the entire manuscript need to be corrected.	1) I agree with notice of Reviewer's comment and the abstract was recorrected . 2) The study was performed to detect the relationship between the age and increasing of colorectal cancer, determined the commonest types of colorectal cancer. 3) Data collection method was retrospective. 4) Ethical consent was added to the study. 5) There is no information about type of surgery and T ,N stages of cancer because the study performed on the data in hospital. 6) All grammars in this manuscript were recorrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This study does not add innovation to the literature.	