

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75357

**Title:** Change point analysis validation of the learning curve in laparoscopic colorectal surgery: Experience from a non-structured training setting

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05936182

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-26 03:39

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-26 03:46

**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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style due to not native language.

1. The title reflect the main subject about laparoscopic colorectal surgery, title was clear and easy to understand.
2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript.
3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.
4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain laparoscopic colorectal surgery in many contexts.
5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, with demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration. I suggest the authors explain about data gathering in details - methods was chart review only or included medical database - Who's the role of chart review ? one or more physician ? - method of data validation (missing data was excluded ?)
6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study.
7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically.
8. Tables and figures sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents.
9. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics.
10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75357

**Title:** Change point analysis validation of the learning curve in laparoscopic colorectal surgery: Experience from a non-structured training setting

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05776309

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-06 23:14

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-16 19:05

**Review time:** 9 Days and 19 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
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

<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**

Recommend to accept the manuscript