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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a retrospective article concerning anal stenosis. The topic is interesting but the authors did not develop the manuscript correctly. Statistical analysis is descriptive and mostly non-existent. No checklists or scores to evaluate the results and compare them with the literature. No objective evaluation of the stenosis. The groups are not homogeneous and cannot be compared. The literature is out of date. The text is written in different fonts. Absolutely, no publication priority.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The goal of this study was to determine the best way to treat Anal Stenosis, also known as Anal Stricture, for mild and severe conditions, and to determine which procedure should be performed for which condition in order to achieve the best results by observing how the patient reacted to the procedure that was performed. This manuscript is suitable for publication.