

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

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.