

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 70828

**Title:** Comparison of clinical efficacy and postoperative inflammatory response between laparoscopic and open radical resection of colorectal cancer

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06081549

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-06 10:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-14 08:44

**Review time:** 7 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The article with the title “Comparison of clinical efficacy and postoperative inflammatory response between laparoscopic and open radical resection of colorectal cancer” is in generally well done. 1. Title reflect the main subject of the manuscript; 2. Abstract is good (it summarizes and reflect the work described in manuscript); 3. Key words is ok; 4 Background is adequate; 5. Methods: It was not described how many patients initially selected were excluded. Were all admitted patients selected? 6. Results are ok; 7. Discussion: ok; 8 Illustrations and tables: ok; 9 Biostatistics.: ok; Units used: ok; 10. References: ok. 11. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Language and grammar are appropriated. 12. The manuscript met the requirements of ethics.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 70828

**Title:** Comparison of clinical efficacy and postoperative inflammatory response between laparoscopic and open radical resection of colorectal cancer

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06058861

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-06 10:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-14 08:44

**Review time:** 7 Days and 21 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

The topic of this work is interesting. In this manuscript, a total of 96 patients with colorectal cancer were selected and divided into the study group and the control group to explore and discuss clinical efficacy and postoperative inflammatory response of laparoscopic and open radical resection of colorectal cancer. The perioperative conditions, inflammatory response index levels before and after operation, pain stress response indices and the incidence of the complications between the two groups were counted. They finally concluded that laparoscopic radical resection of colorectal cancer can reduce surgical trauma, reduce inflammatory response, and pain stress response caused by surgical treatment, which is conducive to shorten the rehabilitation process of patients with a low incidence of complications and safety. The tables help the readers to make a more understanding of the study. The whole manuscript is well drafted. The reviewer has no comments.