

February 8, 2022

Dear editor, Please find attached files of revised manuscript in word format

Reviewer Name: Anonymous

Review Date: 2022-01-02 10:39

Specific Comments To Authors: The article with the title “The evaluation of the clinical efficacy and safety of TST33 mega hemorrhoidectomy for severe prolapsed hemorrhoids” is in generally well done. It is well written and highly interesting. The study is well designed and presented with optimal analysis, discussion, tabulation and graphic display of data. Thank you for giving opportunity to review this study. However, the following points must be considered before publication. In my opinion, note that the additional expanded discussions are mandatory. In addition, I would like to know how the author keeps the study single-blind? In the Materials and Methods, the treatment methods of the two operations are different. How to ensure that the patient does not know which group he is in?

After receiving the comments:

1. We re-colored the language of the manuscript and corrected some language errors. 2. We further clarification of inclusion criteria 3. We 're a retrospective study, but we have further improved the explanation.

Reviewer Name: Anonymous

Review Date: 2021-12-30 11:17

Specific Comments To Authors: In this study, the authors explore the effect of TST33 mega stapler prolapse and hemorrhoid mucosal resection in the treatment of patients with severe prolapsed hemorrhoids by comparing the operation time, intraoperative blood loss, hospitalization time, cure rate, pain degree, anal edema degree, anal Wexner score and surgical complications. This study analyzes the advantages of TST33 mega stapler hemorrhoid mucosal resection in the treatment of severe prolapsed hemorrhoids and showed the reduced incidence of postoperative complications, which was in line with the patient-oriented treatment concept of modern surgery and provided a certain basis for the clinical operation in the treatment of severe prolapsed hemorrhoids. The results are interesting and add valuable knowledge to these two treatments. I would suggest it publish in WJCC if the authors can address the following concerns. 1. The article is very organized and complete, but I still recommend revising the Abstract. For example, the sentence "The traditional treatment is mostly for hemorrhoids" is redundant and needs to be deleted; there are some discrepancies between the detection indicators in the method section and the main text, please check and modify...

2. Figure 2 and Figure 3 did not appear in the main text. Please check the number of the figures. All pictures should appear in order in the main text. Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to review.

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

After receiving the comments:

1. Delete multiple contents in the article, Method section of the article was modified and further verified
2. Figures are repeated with tables, so delete