

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 40134

Title: Recurrence Rates after Endoscopic Resection of Large Colorectal Polyps: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05469117

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Chief Physician, Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-03 01:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-03 15:46

Review time: 13 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 Grade E: Do not publish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

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for inviting me to evaluate the meta-analysis titled "Recurrence Rates after Endoscopic Resection of Large Colorectal Polyps: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis". It is an interesting paper, which analyze local recurrence rates(LRR) of large colonic polyps in a systematic review and meta- analysis, meanwhile shows the author's conclusion that LRR were lowest when EMR with systematic margin ablation (3.3%) or ESD (1.7%) were used for endoscopic removal of large (>10 mm) colorectal polyps,when standard EMR (without margin ablation) or with partial margin ablation were used, LRRs were high (15.2% and 16.5%, respectively).Thus, these techniques should be considered standard for endoscopic removal of large colorectal polyps.The paper is well arranged and the logic is clear, and. The cited literature is comprehensive and modern. The quality of language of the manuscript is quite acceptable for me. There are some advices for author: 1)In TABLE 1,there are confusing data in this table,such as "the values of Resection method/Polyps ≥ 10 mm and ≥ 20 mm/ Hot EMR, some margin ablation and Hot EMR, with margin ablation are the same.Why the values of Polyps(≥ 10 mm and ≥ 20 mm) are inconsistent with that of Resection method/Polyps ≥ 10 mm and Polyps ≥ 20 mm?2)Please add the data of safety comparison in these studies.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 40134

Title: Recurrence Rates after Endoscopic Resection of Large Colorectal Polyps: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05118185

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-05 03:13

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-05 03:51

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 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 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="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a high-quality meta-analysis and in my opinion, it is qualified for publication by WJG editorial office. This paper was well-written, and the main conclusion as “LRR is significantly lower after ESD or EMR with routine margin ablation; thus, these techniques should be considered standard for endoscopic removal of large colorectal polyps” has concrete evidence and would be useful for WJG readers as a good take home-message. One of my questions: is the searching strategy optimal? The primary searching has over 6,000 results but the authors had excluded around 4,000 papers just by reading the titles. Would the author consider to modify their searching terms, so the results could more focus on the research topic of this study.