

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 37614

Title: Low-pressure pneumoperitoneum with abdominal wall lift in laparoscopic total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer: initial experience.

Reviewer's code: 02857975

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-01-11

Date reviewed: 2018-01-17

Review time: 5 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Over all, the study is well designed and the manuscript is well written. 1 A frequent disadvantage during laparoscopic surgery with LPP or AWL is that the operative field is less optimal, which increases technical difficulties. The authors combined LPP with AWL and initially used this technique in a case of laparoscopic single-site cholecystectomy, previously. In the present study, the authors evaluated the safety and feasibility of LPP with AWL in laparoscopic TME for rectal cancer. 2 The patients was selected and included properly. The clinical data is clear. 3 Results are interesting. The recent published references in 2016 and 2017 were included and discussed. 4 Figures and table are clear, and make the manuscript more interesting. In my opinion, after some editings, this manuscript can be accepted, and published in the journal.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 37614

Title: Low-pressure pneumoperitoneum with abdominal wall lift in laparoscopic total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer: initial experience.

Reviewer's code: 03011870

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-01-11

Date reviewed: 2018-01-22

Review time: 10 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Excellent study. I suggest to publish it.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 37614

Title: Low-pressure pneumoperitoneum with abdominal wall lift in laparoscopic total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer: initial experience.

Reviewer's code: 03024280

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-01-11

Date reviewed: 2018-01-22

Review time: 10 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Acceptance with some minor language revision.