PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 79866

Title: Analysis of the impact of ERAS-based respiratory function training on older patients' ability to prevent pulmonary complications after abdominal surgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368064

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-12 09:27

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-12 10:03

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have demonstrated that ERAS-based respiratory function training might help elderly patients who have abdominal surgery to have less pulmonary complications after surgery. In China, pulmonary complications exactly threaten the recovery of older patients. The authors provide a more thorough and detailed analysis at the effects on ERAS-based respiratory function training on older patients' ability to prevent pulmonary complications. This study is interesting and valuable and deserves to be published.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with interest the article titled 'Analysis of the impact of ERAS-based respiratory function training on older patients' ability to prevent pulmonary complications after abdominal surgery'. This article is a retrospective review of 231 patients who underwent abdominal surgery to find the impact of ERAS respiratory training on the overall outcome in terms of respiratory complications and length of stay in hospital. Though the overall concept is good, some shortcomings of this article were noted, which need to be addressed.   1. Since this is a retrospective study, compliance of the study subjects to the preoperative ERAS regimen cannot be confirmed. This forms a significant bias in the data analysis and is a major flaw in the study 2. In exclusion criteria, did you exclude all patients who needed mechanical ventilation after surgery? If yes, why? What were the criteria for postoperative mechanical ventilation in those patients who did not have pre-existing lung pathologies? 3. How was the sample size or study duration decided in this observational study? Is it possible to do a possible to do a post- hoc analysis of the power of the study to detect difference in respiratory complications attributable to ERAS based respiratory training? 4. Kindly elaborate on the respiratory training methods used in the preoperative period as these form the crux of clinical application of this study. What was the end point seen by the study investigator group to fulfil patient for inclusion in the case group. 5. Please insert a reference or a table citing the Borg scale used 6. In table 3, The details must include columns for total number of patients, case group and control group for the duration – baseline and daily till fourth day to bring data in perspective. 7. Kindly mention column percentages in Table 4 to actually reflect the number of patients who had respiratory infections, since it seems that more patients

with raised counts, alteration in lung x-ray, antibiotic use were present in case group. 8. Why only FEV1/FVC has been taken to test PFT as it reflects the obstructive component and even restrictive defects may be present in respiratory infections? 9. There are some language errors which need to be corrected. These are highlighted in the manuscript with comments. Kindly revise the manuscript as per the comments given here and in the manuscript to improve it's significance and quality.   Best wishes

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I appreciate getting the chance of reviewing your valuable manuscripts. I tried to consider some comments which might improve your study. Please check my comments and revise them if you consider them necessary.   1.   You mentioned a case group as an intervention group. I considered "ERAS group" might be appropriate in your study. Please check and revise them.   2. One of the primary endpoints of your study, respiratory infection rates were lower in the ERAS group than in the control group. But, it was not the breakthrough finding. You should add the originality of this finding in the discussion part. Please check and revise them.   3. Table 1 was shown the baseline characteristics of patients. Table 2 provides the variation of the surgery. There were no percentages written in this table. How did you make sure of the statistical differences between the two groups or among the differences in surgical variations? Please check and add the appropriate information in your text and table.   4.   Table 3 includes only all patient's changes in clinical parameters. How did those parameters differ between the ERAS group and the control group? Please check and revise them.   5. Table 4 did not provide information on how you compared the data between the two groups. Please check and revise them.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 79866

Title: Analysis of the impact of ERAS-based respiratory function training on older patients' ability to prevent pulmonary complications after abdominal surgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02489089

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor, Nurse, Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Austria

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-09

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-01 10:30

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-06 19:27

Review time: 5 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors! am very happy getting the chance to review your manuscript. Here is my evaluation: The title reflects the main subjecthesis of the manuscript. The abstract summarize and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The key words reflects the focus of your manuscript, it also adequately describes the background, present status and significance of your study. The manuscript describes methods (data analysis) in an appropriate way. Research objectives are achieved by the experiments and statistical analysis used in this study. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. Findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. Discussion is accurate and discusses the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. The figure and tables are sufficient, in good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents.   The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Style, language and grammar is accurate and appropriate. Authors prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics. Best regards! Your reviewer

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 79866

Title: Analysis of the impact of ERAS-based respiratory function training on older patients' ability to prevent pulmonary complications after abdominal surgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06367185

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Associate Research Scientist, Lecturer, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ethiopia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-09

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-01 12:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-09 08:21

Review time: 7 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- rewrite the abstract by correcting the grammar - Correct your introduction section elaborate the problem and its consequences more - Methods are not specific enough

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read the revised manuscript carefully. I congratulate the authors on adequately answering all the raised queries. The revised manuscript may be accepted for publication.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 79866

Title: Analysis of the impact of ERAS-based respiratory function training on older patients' ability to prevent pulmonary complications after abdominal surgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06367185

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Associate Research Scientist, Lecturer, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ethiopia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-09

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-21 07:33

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-21 07:37

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [Y] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [Y] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The methods and writeup don't deserve to be published in a scientific journal.