

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 89686

**Title:** Study on gender differences and potential clinical value of three-dimensional computerized tomography pelvimetry in rectal cancer patients

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06179533

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-11-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-11-09 11:37

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-11-17 11:35

**Review time:** 7 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
<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

The authors addressed an anatomical problem that is important in the surgical approach. I will make a few suggestions to make the article more interesting.

1. Introduction: The type of rectal cancer operations and the importance of pelvic measurements in these operations should be explained in more detail.
2. Introduction: The shortcomings of the studies summarized as 1-5 should be given in more detail.
3. Introduction: Data regarding the number of patients and methodology of the findings should be extracted.
4. Discussion: In the first paragraphs, only gynecological operations were mentioned, but the study actually deals with rectal operations. The discussion should be expanded in this direction.
5. Discussion: Study limitations should be presented. In particular, it appears that intraobserver and interobserver variability were not studied during the measurements. This should be explained or added to the limitations.