



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 113040

Title: Perioperative characteristics and outcomes of colorectal cancer in elderly patients

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 08264420

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: PhD, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Manuscript submission date: 2025-08-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Editor

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-08-21 06:51

Reviewer performed review: 2025-08-26 16:12

Review time: 5 Days and 9 Hours

Content to be reviewed	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? Yes Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? Yes Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? Yes Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? Yes Are the Key Words complete? Yes Is the content of the Introduction adequate? Yes
-------------------------------	--



Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

	<p>Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete? No</p> <p>Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? Yes</p> <p>Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? Yes</p> <p>Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? Yes</p> <p>Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? Yes</p> <p>Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? Yes</p> <p>Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? No</p> <p>Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? No</p> <p>Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? Yes</p> <p>Is the Conclusion reasonable? Yes</p> <p>Are all references necessary and reasonable? Yes</p> <p>Do authors omit important references? No</p> <p>Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? No</p> <p>Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? Yes</p> <p>Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? Yes</p> <p>Are additional experiments needed for the study? No</p> <p>Does the research scope comply with ethics? Yes</p>
<p>Scientific quality</p>	<p>Grade A (Excellent)</p>



Novelty of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Language quality	Grade B (Very good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	No
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Minor revision
Re-review	No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No
Are your review comments generated by AI tools?	No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Abstract part

1. In the results section

The classification criteria for "BMI" is not clear (whether it is an Asian standard or a global standard), and it is recommended that the basis for classification be specified.

2. In the results section

Are the results related to gender and, if so, please state

Core Tips Section

3. "Our study provides valuable regional insights into perioperative characteristics and



prognostic factors in older CRC "patients" and "valuable" are subjective words, which are suggested to be deleted.

Materials and Methods section

4. In the patient recruitment section

In "Data collection will be traced from the patient's folder record", "traced" is suggested to be changed to "extracted". I'm going to use the word "extracted". I'm going to use "traced"

5. In the statistical analysis section

There is an error in the tense in "Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 27 will be used", "will be used" should be "was used", and the tense of the full text should be unified to the past tense.

6. In the statistical analysis section

The experimental data can be written in the above when introducing the relevant methods required for this experiment

The specific types of postoperative complications (such as anastomotic leakage, pneumonia, wound infection, etc.) are not reported, but only Clavien-Dindo classification is reported, which is recommended to be added

Results Section

7. In the section on Patient Demographics and Baseline characteristics

carcinoembryonic antigen was not indicated in "CEA".

8. In the section on Pathology and surgical information

Due to the age of the elderly, different factors affecting the surgical method are suggested to write

9. In the section on Pathology and Surgical information

The reason for the N0, N1, and N2 distinction is not suggested here, nor is it stated whether the M stage is based on preoperative imaging or postoperative pathology



10. In the section on Pathology and Surgical information

Key survival data, such as median follow-up time, loss to follow-up rate, and Kaplan-Meier curves, were not provided in the recommendation improvement results section

This article mentioned "5-year survival" several times, but the key survival data such as median follow-up time, loss to follow-up rate and Kaplan-Meier curve were not provided in the results section, which could not verify the rationality of "5-year survival".

11. In the postoperative characteristics section

The specific types of postoperative complications (such as anastomotic leakage, pneumonia, wound infection, etc.) are reported instead of Clavien-Dindo classification, which is recommended to be supplemented

12. In the postoperative characteristics section

The 30-day mortality rate was suggested to exclude the risk of this experiment

Discussion Section

13. It would be better to give some examples of the comorbidities and potential functional limitations associated with CRC

14. There is a significant association between recurrence and follow-up. It is recommended to write this association more clearly

15. First of all, please explain whether the reference to the higher mortality rate of men than women does not contradict the above statement that the cure rate is independent of gender; Secondly, please explain whether the mention of the higher incidence of Chinese than Malays is contrary to the above statement that the cure rate is not related to race

16. It would be better to illustrate the significant association between adjuvant therapy and cancer recurrence

Icon section



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

17.table1 format is not aligned

Recommendation: Minor revision. The above issues must be addressed by adding data, clarifying methodology, and improving digital presentation to ensure research rigor and interpretability.