



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_43771
Title of the Manuscript:	Primary Gastrointestinal Lymphomas in Emergency Surgery
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Mention the Study design in the abstract. Spell check required in line 8 Reframe line 6 in results section. Methodology is written in results section. Write more specific keywords than diffuse or obstruction Mention ethical approval details in the methodology section. Modify line 49. Reframe line 52 to 55. Reframe line 59 and 66. Why was median calculated? Line 60 is incomplete. The results section has many statements describing the procedure. Study findings have to be elaborated. Was there any statistical analysis done? Tables and figures should be presented as per their appearance in the text and not at the end. Line 72 and 74 is the repetition from introduction and results respectively. Age is mentioned as mean here. Reframe line 75. Line 78 has to be mentioned in results. Rewrite discussion. Conclusion mentioned at the end of the manuscript is same as that in the abstract. Kindly elaborate Was an Ethical committee approval obtained? There is no mention of the same in the manuscript. Details of ethical approval whether obtained is not mentioned. In the reference section, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]. Reference 3 lacks edition number. List the first six authors followed by et al. Give references of few more recent studies done	1. The purpose of the study has been clearly stated in the abstract. 2. The results section in the abstract has been reorganized. 3. The inappropriate keywords have been replaced by the two appropriate ones. 4. Typos, grammar and fonts have been corrected in the entire article. 5. Ethical approval details have been stated in the methods section. 6. No statistical methods were used in the study. 7. It is written wrongly. It should be mean age instead of median. 8. The discussion section has been re-written. 9. Table and figures have been fixed. 10. The result section has been detailed. 11. Reference numbers have been specified with []. 12. Data in the references have been corrected. 13. Nine new reference papers have been added into the references section.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	