



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	ABSTRACT - Background: authors have simply stated the aim without any study context; <i>background = study context + aim</i> - Results: attn.! Line 16-17: not a sentence; <i>sentence = subject + predicate</i> - Title: it does not convey key themes of the study. To my understanding, study was aimed at retrospectively identify indicative signs of primary gastrointestinal tract lymphoma in emergency surgery. I expect the title to convey such information that fall within the scope of the study. INTRODUCTION - attn.! What about aim? MATERIALS & METHODS - line 53-55: to revise the grammar RESULTS - tables and figures should accompany their respective comments REFERE NCES - I would invite authors to harmonize the reference list; some discrepancies are observed in the style. As an example, figures in ref 4: <i>J Clin. Oncol</i> 2001; 19:3861-	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	73, and ref 5: <i>Cancer</i> 97:2462-2473, 2003 do not follow the same pattern. - Authors should as well try some updates; much of the consulted literature date far back a decade.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The language needs thorough revision especially at the level of sentence structure	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Ethical issue: YES. Authors made no mention of ethical approval of research; I think the present work needed prior ethical approval and consent to attain patients' medical files	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tabé Franklin Nyenty</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Biomedical Sciences, University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon</i>