Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJCRS_83418**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Double Primary Tumors: Synchronous of Prostate cancer and Rectum cancer. A case report**
Type of the Article	**Case report**

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:

(https://www.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/editorial-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	1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "as development" maybe as "as the development"; "cancer are commonly" as "cancer is commonly"; "renal" as "the renal"; "diagnosed of" as "was diagnosed with"; "are rather" as "is rather"; "have different" as "have a different"; "top two commonest" as "he top two most commonest"; "multiple" as "of multiple"; "as number" as "as a number"; "10-30% increase" as "a 10-30% increased"; "have increase" as "has increased"; "on managing" as "of managing"; "for benign" as "with benign"; "single" as "a single"; "prostate were arrange" as "the prostate were arranged"; "total" as "a total"; "on left" as "on the left"; "on right" as "on the right"; "prostate shown" as "prostate showed or prostate have shown"; "capsular" as "the capsular"; "neurovascular bundle ," as "the neurovascular bundle,"; "with clear" as "with a clear"; "anal" as "the anal"; "urologist" as "a urologist"; "prostate gland shown" as "the prostate gland showed"; "confined within prostatic" as "is confined within the prostatic"; "colon" as "the colon"; "prostate" as "the prostate"; "rectum" as "the rectum"; "as development" as "as the development"; "second" as "a second"; "Synchronous" as "The synchronous"; "evaluate of" as "evaluate"; "are clear" as "is a clear"; "were no" as "was no"; "early" as "the early"; "patient diagnosed" as "the patient is diagnosed"; "Patient" as "The patient"; "if estimated" as "if the estimated"; "patient with localised" as "a patient with the localised"; "latest" as "the latest"; "suggest for" as "suggests"; "of patient" as "of the patient"; "therapy not" as "therapy is not"; "rigorous" as "the rigorous"; "of the first" as "of first"; "of the second" as "of second". The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words "characteristic" maybe as "characteristics"; "difference organ" as "different organs"; "rarer compare" as "rarer compared"; "gentlemen" as "gentleman"; "intermediate risk" as "intermediate-risk"; "1 years" as "1 year"; "well controlled" as "well-controlled"; "prostate specific" as "prostate-specific"; "HPE shown" as "HPE showed"; "follow up" as "follow-up"; "were confirm" as "were confirmed"; "investigation shown" as "investigation showed"; "robotic assisted" as "robotic-assisted"; "ultra low" as "ultra-low"; "5 week" as "5 weeks"; "post CCRT" as "post-CCRT"; "shown complete" as "showed complete"; "in male" as "in males"; "be exclude" as "be excluded"; "Several review" as "Several reviews"; "most neoplasm" as "most neoplasms"; "genitourinary system" as "genitourinary systems"; "depend on" as "depends on"; "preference" as "preferences"; "intermediate risk" as "intermediate-risk"; "exceed 5%" as "exceeds 5%"; "LARC patient" as "LARC patients"; "be consider" as "be considered". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 3. The authors should include the statement of ethical clearance or the patients consent in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	3. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, Multiple primary tumors (MPT). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words need to be abbreviated. 5. In histopathological staining images, the kind of different observation noted may be highlighted or marked (by arrow) for better understanding. 6. The references are not arranged properly in a uniform format and it should be carefully checked and corrected as per the journal instructions. For example, a few references are not cited properly with volume or page numbers (Refernece number 2, 15).	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The authors have put effort to evaluate the “Double Primary Tumors: Synchronous of Prostate cancer and Rectum cancer. A case report”. The authors describe the research undertaken with this in an organized manner, emphasizing the results obtained by them. The article needs modification for better cohesion of information to achieve the goal and the shortcomings which need to be considered. Hence, the paper can be accepted after MINOR REVISIONS are carried out.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**A. Vijaya Anand**
Department, University & Country	**Bharathiar University, India**