

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 81863

Title: Ten-year multicentric retrospective analysis regarding postoperative complications and impact of comorbidities in hemorrhoidal surgery with literature review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05400121

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor, MD, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Romania

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-27 14:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-27 14:30

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	<p>Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? [J31] Yes [J30] No</p> <p>Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? [J41] Yes [J40] No</p> <p>Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? [J51] Yes [J50] No</p> <p>Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? [J61] Yes [J60] No</p>
Language quality	<p>[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</p> <p>[] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection</p>
Conclusion	<p>[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority)</p> <p>[Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection</p>
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	<p>Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous</p> <p>Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No</p>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an overall well written manuscript. I would suggest to add and discuss new evidence on the outcomes of surgery for HD in patients with IBD (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35160159/>)

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 81863

Title: Ten-year multicentric retrospective analysis regarding postoperative complications and impact of comorbidities in hemorrhoidal surgery with literature review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05142913

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor, MBBS

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: Romania

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-28 03:32

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-28 03:33

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
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

	<p>Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? [J31] Yes [J30] No</p> <p>Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? [J41] Yes [J40] No</p> <p>Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? [J51] Yes [J50] No</p> <p>Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? [J61] Yes [J60] No</p>
Language quality	<p>[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</p> <p>[] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection</p>
Conclusion	<p>[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</p> <p>[] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection</p>
Re-review	<p>[] Yes [Y] No</p>
Peer-reviewer statements	<p>Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous</p> <p>Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No</p>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting article. Well written. However, needs language editing, thanks