PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 82448

Title: Nutritional status efficacy of early nutritional support in gastrointestinal care: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05346014

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-19 19:53

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-28 08:49

Review time: 8 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, Meta-analysis was used to evaluate the effect of early nutritional support on postoperative nutritional indicators of patients. The study presents high quality and deals with important clinical issue, such type of study is needed. I have only few small remarks that authors should address properly. I recommend to accept the manuscript after minor revision. There are only some points to correct: a. Please provide the full name of all abbreviations. b. Introduction and discussion section need improvement; please provide information on how your results will translate into clinical practice; c. In discussion section please provide study strong points and study limitation section. d. Please correct typos All abovementioned issues are crucial for the credibility of the results. The paper can be accepted only after addressing all the issues. I recommend to accept the manuscript after minor revision.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 82448

Title: Nutritional status efficacy of early nutritional support in gastrointestinal care: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06200872

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-30 01:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-08 10:16

Review time: 9 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a well-structured manuscript and an interesting topic. Different studies have reached different conclusions about the effect of early postoperative nutritional support on the nutritional status of patients. This interesting RCT meta-analysis discusses this point. However, some improvements are needed: -Abstract should be presented within subsections i.e., background, aim, method, results, as well as conclusion. -Core tip is missing. -Please discuss about restrictions of relevant previous meta-analysis studies.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors explored the effectiveness of early nutritional support for the nutritional status of patients undergoing gastrointestinal surgery, providing strong evidence for early nutritional care after surgery. The authors employed Pubmed, Embase, Springer Link, Ovid, CNKI, CBM databases to conduct a meta-analysis of the articles on the relative comparison of early nutritional support with delayed nutritional support. Results of metanalysis: - patients receiving early nutritional support had higher serum albumin levels; - patients receiving early nutritional support had shorter hospital stays; - patients receiving early nutritional support had shorter first defecation time; - patients receiving early nutritional support had fewer complications. The present study has impecable methodology with illustrative figures, and a very concise discussion of the effect of early nutritional support on postoperative nutritional indicators of patients and the possible future possibilites for clinical application.