



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 79627

Title: Outcomes after natural orifice extraction versus conventional specimen extraction surgery for colorectal cancer: A propensity score-matched analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04438815

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-30 21:56

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-30 22:11

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

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

1. Well written, the study seems reasonable statistically, but the number of patient enrolled seem a bit small.
2. Are there any methods that you used to evaluate the success rate of NOSE before surgery?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 79627

Title: Outcomes after natural orifice extraction versus conventional specimen extraction surgery for colorectal cancer: A propensity score-matched analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04671880

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, N/A

Professional title: Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist, Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-07 08:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-09 11:08

Review time: 2 Days and 2 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



**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

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

Thank you to have submitted your manuscript. Below the report. The title reflect the main subject of the manuscript. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript and the key words reflects the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript describes the methods in adequate details. The contributions of the study tends to demonstrate the benefit of reduced port laparoscopic colorectal surgery with natural orifice specimen extraction compared to conventional laparoscopic colorectal surgery that could represent a natural progression towards scarless surgery. The tables are sufficient, of good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. About the discussion: the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability and relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. Observations/Remarks The sample is small: are the Authors sure that it is sufficient to achieve your conclusions? The absence of the figures make difficult to be sure about the clearly description of the surgical technique. About method surgical technique it is mandatory to specify how many patients required an ileostomy: this is crucial about the holy grail of no scar surgery; probably it is better to pull out this patient if that is the only one. About follow up it is not correct to report information about recurrence because the shortness of observation. About this parameter we need longer follow up.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 79627

Title: Outcomes after natural orifice extraction versus conventional specimen extraction surgery for colorectal cancer: A propensity score-matched analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06365757

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-11 19:38

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-19 13:48

Review time: 7 Days and 18 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**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

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

The article is well structured, according to the guideline provided by the journal. I have a few questions to the authors, on which they can elaborate a little bit in the text: How was the transanal pullthrough for sigmoid cancer performed when you have the full length of the rectum preserved? Patients 3,4,7 and 8 all had sigmoid cancer but transvaginal NOSE was performed only in patient 3. What was the selection criteria for transvaginal NOSE?