



**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**

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 112256

**Title:** Effect of perioperative glutamine-enriched nutritional support on patients with colorectal cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 08036927

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree and professional title:** Assistant Professor, Lecturer, PhD, Senior Researcher

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Ethiopia

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2025-07-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** Hong-Xin Jiang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-08-05 18:32

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-08-08 18:12

**Review time:** 2 Days and 23 Hours

<b>Content to be reviewed</b>	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? <b>Yes</b> Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? <b>No</b> Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? <b>Yes</b> Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? <b>Yes</b>
-------------------------------	--



# 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

Are the Key Words complete? **No**

Is the content of the Introduction adequate? **Yes**

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?  
**No**

Is the description of the experiments clear and  
complete? **Yes**

Are the experimental data presented in the  
manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Yes**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and  
reliable? **Yes**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to  
standard? **Not Applicable**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables  
follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Yes**

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**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in  
the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Not  
Applicable**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **Yes**

Are all references related to the topic of the  
manuscript? **No**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**

Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers?  
**Yes**



	Are additional experiments needed for the study? <b>No</b> Does the research scope comply with ethics? <b>Yes</b>
Scientific quality	Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade A (Excellent)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade A (Excellent)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Language quality	Grade A (Excellent)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	Yes
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Major revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No
Are your review comments generated by AI tools?	No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract Section :

Section #1 :The rationale is well presented; however, for clarity across disciplines, key terms such as glutamine and colorectal cancer should be scientifically justified in the background. Strengthening these definitions will enhance reader understanding and support the well-structured rationale.



**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

Section #2 : While the study topic is clear, the objective in the abstract appears fragmented and lacks clarity. The sentence is overly long and presents an unfinished idea. For example, the statement: “To evaluate the clinical significance of perioperative glutamine (Gln)-enriched nutritional support on postoperative nutritional status, nitrogen balance, immune function, inflammation levels, morbidity of postoperative complications, and length of hospital stay in patients with CRC” ends without clearly stating what is being measured or concluded regarding these variables. I recommend restructuring the objective for coherence, conciseness, and completeness.

Abstract Methods & Results Section:

The Methods section of abstract contains an overly long sentence that may hinder clarity and readability. It is recommended to break it into shorter, more concise statements to ensure the methodological approach is clearly communicated to readers from diverse backgrounds. The Methods and Results sections in the abstract appear to be mixed. For instance, the sentence “The meta-analysis ultimately included 27 studies, with a total of 1643 patients; 827 patients received perioperative Gln treatment, and 816 received conventional nutritional therapy” reflects methodological detail and should be placed in the Methods section, not under Results. Additionally, the Results section should focus on presenting the key findings rather than overloading it with multiple statistical values. While statistical outputs are essential to validate observations, they should support rather than overshadow the main conclusions

NB: Please check that the keywords are listed in alphabetical order, as per journal guidelines.

Introduction section

#1 : The concept of colorectal cancer should be scientifically justified in the background to enhance clarity for a broader readership. Additionally, regarding citation [1], the authors refer to data from Freddie B et al., but the referenced figure in Table 1 indicates a



global incidence of 9.6%, ranking colorectal cancer third not second. Please revise this statement to accurately reflect the original source.

#2 The statement “Previous clinical studies have indicated that Gln plays a positive role in the short-term clinical efficacy of CRC surgery” lacks specific citations. Please clarify which studies are being referred to by providing appropriate references to support this claim. in addition this section has long sentence which hinder clarity

#3 [21]. However, one study reported which study is it ?

#4 Data Sources and Search Strategy:

For improved clarity and readability, it is recommended to present the data sources and search strategy in a table format, supported by a brief narrative explanation. This will help readers easily follow the databases used, search terms, and inclusion criteria.

# 5 Study Selection:

The inclusion criteria, such as limiting to adult patients diagnosed with colon or rectal cancer and treated surgically regardless of race or sex, should be supported with justified reasoning or relevant citations. Similarly, the selection of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) as the study design should be backed by appropriate references that align with the study’s objective and methodological rigor. Providing this context will strengthen the transparency and scientific foundation of the study selection process.

# 6 Data Extraction

The statement that “two researchers” conducted the data extraction lacks clarity. Please specify who these researchers are (e.g., by initials) and describe their roles in the process, including how discrepancies were resolved. Additionally, this section would benefit from a summarized presentation of the data sources and search strategy in a table format, supported by a brief narrative explanation with citation . This will enhance transparency and reproducibility of the methodology.

Data Syntheses and Analyses:



**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

The phrase “the combined effects of all studies on the outcome variables” is vague please clarify what “all studies” refers to and ensure it aligns with your inclusion criteria. Additionally, the statement “The results were presented as pooled effect sizes and 95% confidence intervals (CI)” is more appropriate for the Results section rather than the Data Analysis section. Moreover, the Data Syntheses and Analyses section should include or reference the specific statistical models or equations used (e.g., fixed/random effects models, heterogeneity tests), to ensure methodological transparency and reproducibility.