



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42956

Title: Short-term efficacy of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery for low rectal cancer

Reviewer’s code: 03474653

Reviewer’s country: Sweden

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-15

Date reviewed: 2018-11-15

Review time: 8 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A quite good idea and usefull for the future but i think the way they decided to manage with the study display direct signs of low quality. For the first all these case controls where the patient is free to decide the procedure he/she is being operated with , suffers



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

of big bias. A new procedure gives always better objective results. Randomised is best. For the second, there is no references about the PSM matching score system. How about the accuracy of this test to try to balance the baseline data between the groups?? Then comes the problem with the pictures that are too small to follow the procedure even if the describing is with much details. A quite obvious misunderstanding is in the field of statistical analyses where quality variables are tested with t-test or Fisher. Maybe the mean categorical variables otherwise no possible to test quality variables with quantity tests. At the end how was evaluated the patients post op quality of Life? Which test? No references.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42956

Title: Short-term efficacy of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery for low rectal cancer

Reviewer’s code: 02465209

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-15

Date reviewed: 2018-11-19

Review time: 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall a well written and concieved manuscript. What needs to be done is a review of the literature regarding outcomes of natural oraface specimen extraction after laparoscopic resection to compare to the set of cases in this manuscript. This can be



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

done using citation number 5 and others like it (there are several in the literature). In addition, what are limitations of the technique? Can the size of the specimen be too large? Is obesity a problem for this technique? Did you learn other lessons about using this technique?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42956

Title: Short-term efficacy of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery for low rectal cancer

Reviewer’s code: 02549032

Reviewer’s country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-20

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting retrospective comparative study on efficacy of NOSES for low rectal cancer using a prolapsing technique. The authors concluded that NOSES for low rectal cancer has advantages in reducing postoperative pain, shortening the length of the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

postoperative hospital stay, and improving patient satisfaction in terms of a more aesthetic appearance of the abdominal wall. The study is well-written and suitable for publication. .

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42956

Title: Short-term efficacy of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery for low rectal cancer

Reviewer’s code: 01587889

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-15

Date reviewed: 2018-11-20

Review time: 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Masroor et al. is an IRB approved case control study designed to establish association of HbA1C, marker of glycemic control and various grades of fatty infiltration in NAFLD patients. A cohort of 300 individuals were recruited randomly, amongst 150 cases had



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

NAFLD and another 150 patients as controls having no fatty infiltration were identified. NAFLD cases were further classified according to the disease severity. Detailed physical examination was done including BMI measurement, fasting blood glucose (FBS) determined enzymatically and HbA1C by TINIA method. ANOVA was applied to find out differences in the levels (FBS), HbA1C and BMI of healthy individuals and NAFLD patients with various grades. The F statistics depicted significant differences in the mean levels of FBS ($F=10.36$, $p<0.01$), HbA1C ($F=15.64$, $p<0.01$) and BMI ($F=33.70$, $p<0.01$) of healthy individuals and patients with NAFLD. Moreover, post hoc test revealed that HbA1C levels were significantly higher in patients of NAFLD having grades II and III compared grade I. Spearman correlation applied to analyze the relationship of HbA1C and BMI with fatty liver revealed that HbA1C is significantly correlated with BMI ($r=0.274$, $p<0.001$) and with the grades of fatty Liver ($r=0.432$, $p<0.001$). They concluded that the study provides substantial evidence that high HbA1C level is significantly associated with presence of NFLD. Furthermore, the study also shows that its levels are significantly associated with severity of NAFLD. This is a good paper, but I am missing concrete purpose of this bio-finger signature finding. Is it for diagnostic or prognostic or both? What is the significance of this biosignature in clinical setting?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:



Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42956

Title: Short-term efficacy of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery for low rectal cancer

Reviewer’s code: 00503623

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-20

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript reports on the short-term clinical efficacy of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery (NOSES) using prolapsing technique and the conventional laparoscopic-assisted approach for lower rectal cancer. The results obtained with 52



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

patients revealed that NOSES of the low rectal cancer can achieve satisfactory shorth-term efficacy and has advantage in reducing postoperative pain, shortens the hospital stay, and improves the patient satisfaction. This is well presented and amply documented presentation.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- [Y] No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42956

Title: Short-term efficacy of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery for low rectal cancer

Reviewer’s code: 02438768

Reviewer’s country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-21

Review time: 2 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments for ESPS Manuscript NO 42956 This paper is interesting. There are no major and few minor concerns. Regarding the latter, minor language polishing is needed. For example, page 2, second line of Methods. Change “Our” to “our”. Page 3, third line of



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Introduction. Change “From the recent, rapid development ” to “From the recent rapid development”. The authors should check their paper carefully for grammar and punctuation mistakes.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42956

Title: Short-term efficacy of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery for low rectal cancer

Reviewer’s code: 03028174

Reviewer’s country: Thailand

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-23

Review time: 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is aimed to compare the short-term clinical efficacy of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery (NOSES) using a prolapsing technique and the conventional laparoscopic-assisted approach for low rectal cancer. The title is “Short-term efficacy



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

of natural orifice specimen extraction surgery for low rectal cancer using a prolapsing technique based on propensity score matching". 1. This is a case-control study. 2. A sample size of the study is relatively small. 3. Please review the literature and add more details. 4. Please add the limitations of the study in the discussion section. 5. What are the new knowledges from this study? 6. Finally, please recommend the readers "How to apply this knowledge for routine clinical practice?".

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No