



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “The Role of the G8 Score in Therapeutic Decisions for Elderly Patients With Colorectal Cancer: Experience From the Department of Medical Oncology, Ibn Sina Military Hospital of Marrakech”

Submitted: 22 July 2026

Accepted: 30 September 2026

Published: 31 October 2026

Corresponding Author: Sawadogo Moussa Abdoul Aziz

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n30p77

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Akmel Meless Simeon
Ouattara University, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 2: Artemisi Shehu Dono
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement to the authors and editors of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published, or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: August 20, 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: September 7, 2026
Manuscript Title: Impact of Geriatric Assessment Using the G8 Score on Treatment Choice in Elderly Patients With Colorectal Cancer: Experience of the Medical Oncology Department, Avicenne Military Hospital Marrakech	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: no	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the “review history” of the paper: no	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	4/5

The title is clear and reflects the main focus of the study. It could possibly be shortened slightly, but it is appropriate for the content of the manuscript.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4/5
The abstract presents the main elements of the study and summarizes the principal findings. However, the objective of the study could be stated more explicitly. The conclusion could also focus more directly on the findings of the present study rather than mainly discussing limitations of previous research	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3/5
The manuscript is generally understandable, but there are several grammatical, punctuation, and formatting problems throughout the text. Some sentences also need improvement for clarity. A careful language revision is recommended before publication.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3/5
The general design, study period, population, G8 classification, and data analysis software are described. However, some methodological points need clarification. The manuscript states that patients over 65 years were included, while the inclusion criteria state “over 18 years old.” This should be corrected. In addition, the statistical methods section mentions multivariable logistic regression models, but the corresponding regression results are not clearly presented in the Results section.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3/5
The results are generally presented clearly and the tables are useful. However, some numerical inconsistencies should be checked. For example, the sensitivity and specificity values reported in the Results section should be compared carefully with those reported later in the Discussion. The authors should verify all percentages, confidence intervals, and statistical terminology before publication.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4/5
The main conclusion is consistent with the study findings, particularly the view that the G8 score may support treatment decisions but should not replace comprehensive geriatric assessment. The conclusion could be slightly revised for clarity and should more directly summarize what was observed in this patient population.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4/5
The references are generally relevant to the topic. However, they should be carefully checked for consistency between publication years, journal information, and DOI details. The formatting of the reference list also needs revision and standardization.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is an interesting study addressing the use of the G8 score in older patients with colorectal cancer. The topic is relevant, and the findings provide useful information from a clinical setting in Morocco.

Before publication, I suggest that the authors address a few points. The inclusion criteria should be corrected because the Methods section refers to patients over 65 years, while the listed criterion states over 18 years. The statistical analysis also needs clarification, particularly the reference to multivariable logistic regression, since these results are not clearly reported. The sensitivity and specificity values should be checked for consistency throughout the manuscript. Finally, the English language, punctuation, and reference formatting would benefit from revision.

With these corrections, the manuscript would be clearer and more consistent.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: