

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 62787

Title: Chylous ascites in colorectal surgery-A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 03668558

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Azerbaijan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-18

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-24 07:34

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-25 18:22

Review time: 1 Day and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to thank for the opportunity to revise this manuscript. This was a systematic review on chylous ascites after colorectal surgery. The Authors included all case reports, studies and one trial on colorectal surgery (both for malignant and benign lesions) published on PUBMED. The main findings of this study was that prevalence of chylous ascites was about 5.5%, even if most of the studies were case series or case reports (therefore the actual prevalence can be over-estimated). The Authors did not find robust evidence about significant risk factors for chylous ascites. However, a low percentage of patients required surgery. My comments: - I agree with the fact that metanalysis was not appropriate, given the high number of case reports/case series. - As mentioned by the Authors, the definition of chylous ascites was heterogeneous among studies, therefore data coming from different studies may be difficult to compare to each other. Similarly, treatment algorithm differed across different studies. - Why patients with chylous ascites displayed more DFS? This point may be clarified (it has been reported only in one study). Different disease stage(s), and therefore type(s) and extent of surgery may play an important role (both on chylous ascites and DFS). - According to the Authors' opinion, what could be the composition of the multidisciplinary team for the treatment of chylous ascites?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 62787

Title: Chylous ascites in colorectal surgery-A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05348360

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Azerbaijan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-18

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-24 03:17

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-26 08:50

Review time: 2 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

There are many case reports in the cited references, and I don't think the reviews have a high level of evidence.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 62787

Title: Chylous ascites in colorectal surgery-A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05348360

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Azerbaijan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-18

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-26 03:23

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-26 03:27

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

None