

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 57442

Title: Comparison of an Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Protocol Versus Conventional Management on Short- and Long-term Outcomes in Patients Undergoing Laparoscopic Gastrectomy: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis

Reviewer's code: 03646555

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BMed, FRACP, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Australia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-06-09

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-07-05 04:18

Reviewer performed review: 2020-07-05 10:15

Review time: 5 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall an excellently written report of a well-designed study with a lot of clinical applicability. I would suggest a few small changes prior to publication: 1) where the term "prognosis" is used in the manuscript, replace with "long-term prognosis" to differentiate these from short-term outcomes. 2) The abstract should more explicitly state if this was a retrospective or prospective study. 3) The abstract uses the term "POD" without clarification. 4) "780 thousand" should be "780,000" (it is not usual English language convention to write the word thousand in these scenarios) 5) There should be a citation after "Pathologic stage according to the American Joint Committee on Cancer, 7th Edition". 6) in Statistical analysis, "qualitative variables were described as numbers (%)" should be "categorical variables were described as numbers and percentages" 7) "quantitative variables" should be "continuous variables" 8) It should be stated that non-normally distributed continuous data should be compared with median and interquartile range, as is scientific convention (not mean +/- standard deviation which only applies to normally distributed data). 9) Fig 3 legend: "stage II" is misspelled as "stsge II"

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 57442

Title: Comparison of an Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Protocol Versus Conventional Management on Short- and Long-term Outcomes in Patients Undergoing Laparoscopic Gastrectomy: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis

Reviewer's code: 03646555

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BMed, FRACP, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Australia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-06-09

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-08-04 03:47

Reviewer performed review: 2020-08-04 05:52

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="radio"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="radio"/> Minor revision <input type="radio"/> Major revision <input type="radio"/> Rejection
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

No further issues since my last review.