

Genitourinary function and defecation after colorectal cancer surgery with low- and high-ligation of inferior mesenteric artery: A meta-analysis

Response to comments

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This is an overall well-written meta-analysis, and should be accepted directly without further review after minor revision. The minor revision is regarding the PRSIMA. There is a recent publication of PRISMA protocol/guideline (published this year), please cite this one.

Response to Reviewer #1:

Thank you so much for your positive and constructive comments. We fully agree with you. In our modified manuscript, we have cited the recent PRISMA guideline published this year in the methods section, line 2.

Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a Meta-Analysis of the Genitourinary function and defecation after colorectal cancer surgery. The topic is within the scope of the WJGO. (1) Classification: Grade A; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is an overall well-written meta-analysis, should be accepted directly after minor revision. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are 3 tables and 19 figures; (4) References: A total of 31 references are cited, including 12 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is 1 self-cited references. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. A language editing certificate issued by International Science Editing was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate and PRISMA 2009 Checklist. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGO. 5 Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; (2) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response to Science editor:

Thank you very much for your kind interest in our manuscript. According to your comments, we amended the relevant part in our modified manuscript. Some of your questions were answered below:

1. The issues raised in the peer-review report have been resolved.
2. We have arranged the figures using PowerPoint, and the original figure documents are uploaded to the revision files, which submit as “67314-Figures.ppt” on the system.
3. The “Article Highlights” section has been added in our modified manuscript at the end of the main text.