

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 87768

**Title:** Effect of different anesthetic modalities with multimodal analgesia on postoperative pain level in colorectal tumor patients

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06120649

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-09-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-09-11 02:50

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-09-24 15:18

**Review time:** 13 Days and 12 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

General impression In this study, the authors explored the effects of different anesthesia methods coupled with multi-mode analgesia on postoperative pain in patients with colorectal cancer. And they concluded that general anesthesia coupled with epidural anesthesia and multimode analgesia can achieve better postoperative analgesia and sedation effects, promote postoperative rehabilitation of patients, improve inflammatory stress and immune status, and have higher safety for colorectal cancer patients. I evaluate this clinical report includes so valuable information for the therapy of postoperative pain. Overall, the article is informative and well written, and easy to understand. For these reasons, I think this manuscript is appropriate for publication. However, I have one minor request to be revised as stated below. After they have been resolved, I will judge this manuscript can be accepted and published by this journal.

1. Methods-Control group. Is “multimodal labor pain” a correct phrase? I hope the authors will confirm its rightness.
2. Discussion. I suggested to supplement the limitations of this study and the direction of future research.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 87768

**Title:** Effect of different anesthetic modalities with multimodal analgesia on postoperative pain level in colorectal tumor patients

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06120660

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Research Associate

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-09-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-09-12 08:37

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-09-25 07:07

**Review time:** 12 Days and 22 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

I read this manuscript with great interesting. The study is well performed. The findings in this study are interesting. Abstract is an important part for readers to understand the research accurately and quickly, and also make the article fuller. The background of this research abstract is missing, so it is suggested to supplement it. In addition, the description of results is too much, generally do not need to list all the results that have been obtained, only need to describe some of the final results in the abstract. Others, The main inadequacies of the article: the innovation of this study is not described in the preface, and the limitations of this study are described less in the final summary. The English expression needs to be further refined. I hope that my comments will be useful in improving the article.