

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70469

**Title:** Does cranial-medial mixed dominant approach have a unique advantage for laparoscopic right hemicolectomy with complete mesocolic excision?

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04153245

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** BM BCh, MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-16 07:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-16 08:13

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Aim of work is not well-clarified at the end of section of "Introduction". Please, clarifiy it.  
Results: This sentence mentioned the same group in comparison "The number of lymph nodes collected in the MA group was  $30.50 \pm 15.31$ , significantly more than that in the MA group ( $23.81 \pm 9.06$ )". Please, revise it. Conclusions: Please, you may not use references within text of conclusion. You may may transfer the sentences documented with references to discussion; and re-write your own conclusion followed by the recommendation.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70469

**Title:** Does cranial-medial mixed dominant approach have a unique advantage for laparoscopic right hemicolectomy with complete mesocolic excision?

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05230210

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-24 12:09

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-27 10:44

**Review time:** 2 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
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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<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 would like to thank the authors for their extensive work. I have some comments on the manuscript for their kind reply. Title: Relevant to the topic Abstract: Good, could you kindly state which stage of colon cancer was in your initial inclusion criteria? Introduction: Good, But I suggest mentioning of the current guidelines, not just the debate about the topic to enrich the background for the reader. Methods: • It is not clear why the surgeons chose one procedure or the other, was it the choice of the patients or due to specific patients' risk? Please explain. Also, please add a flow chart to show the selection of the patients. • There is no laboratory preparation stated in the work up of the patients or base line staging? could the authors give more details about these important points. • In the sentence " we found the anatomic projection of the the ileocolic vessel pedicle" please remove the extra "the". Results: Please add laboratory data at baseline and postoperative. Discussion: Please discuss this relevant study: Comparing standard laparoscopic hemicolectomy to CME radical right colectomy for patients with right sided colon cancer: a randomized controlled feasibility trial, Rutgers, Marieke et al. European Journal of Surgical Oncology, Volume 46, Issue 2, e15 Conclusion: Too long, please summarize and remove citations. Also, you mention the lack of RCTs, but there is an ongoing one, please mention (citation added previously in the comments). Tables and figures: • We suggest the addition of a flow chart for the selection of cases • Please add a table of the baseline and post operative laboratory data.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70469

**Title:** Does cranial-medial mixed dominant approach have a unique advantage for laparoscopic right hemicolectomy with complete mesocolic excision?

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05230210

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li-Li Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-06 03:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-06 04:54

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I would like to that the authors for their reply to the reviewers' comments. I have few notes for their kind consideration. Abstract: in the aim the authors stated " To explore the feasibilities between operational approaches for laparoscopic right hemicolectomy with CME", please state that you examined only two approaches and their exact names. Materials and methods: • At the start you wrote the word "Materials" in a separate line please omit. • You mentioned in the abstract that this is a retrospective cohort study, but this is not mentioned in the methodology section in the manuscript. Also, kindly add the name and place of the database used in collecting the data as required to call it a (retrospective cohort) and not a (case-control study).