



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 82662

Title: Efficacy of transanal drainage tube in preventing anastomotic leakage after surgery for rectal cancer: A meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06497967

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: United States

Author’s Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-01 03:50

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-07 04:19

Review time: 6 Days

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |



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

| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| 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 |
| Peer-reviewer statements | 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 congratulate the authors on this study. Would recommend authors to compare these results to other similar studies and explain the differences in results. Meta analysis done by Zhang, (PMID-36446701), looks at over 3000 patients and has different results. Also would suggest to explain how these results are significant compared to existing literature



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 82662

Title: Efficacy of transanal drainage tube in preventing anastomotic leakage after surgery for rectal cancer: A meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06080724

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-04 05:25

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-17 15:28

Review time: 13 Days and 10 Hours

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |



| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| 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 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 |
| Peer-reviewer statements | 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

The authors performed a meta-analysis about transanal drainage tube for rectal cancer surgery and reported interesting results. I have some suggestions for this manuscript to improve it further.

- 1.The full search strategies for each database should be provided.
- 2.Because of the number of included studies is small (just 5), the result of funnel plot is not accurate. I suggest that the authors use quantitative methods for publication bias, such as Egger and Begg’s tests.
- 3.The methods and rationale for conducting subgroup analyses should be spelled out in the Method section.
- 4.Did the authors reported only the positive result in the subgroup analysis? If there are other subgroup analyses performed in addition to patients without a diverting stoma, they should also be reported in this article.
5. I suggest that the authors perform sensitivity analyses for all pooled results.
6. Discussion can add a section “Comparison With Other Reviews”. It focus on the comparison with other relevant meta-analysis and systematic review, for example, discussing the difference in method and results. In addition, the authors can also discuss the difference in results comparing to retrospective studies.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 82662

Title: Efficacy of transanal drainage tube in preventing anastomotic leakage after surgery for rectal cancer: A meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06080724

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-26

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-01 02:08

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-01 02:20

Review time: 1 Hour

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



**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

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The revised version by authors has addressed my previous concerns.