

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84778

**Title:** Excision of malignant and pre-malignant rectal lesions by transanal endoscopic microsurgery in patients under 50 years of age

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05429233

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

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

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-12 04:28

**Review time:** 8 Days and 2 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish |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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance   |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <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 |
| <b>Conclusion</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection          |
| <b>Re-review</b>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  |
| <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

The manuscript contained novel thought of balance between outcomes and manipulation methods of some certain lesion, which was meaningful and practical. The writing style of the manuscript might be accorded to the journal requirement. For example, some descriptive contents of results and methods might be adjusted. Some contents of limitations descriptions and results contents might be simplified. The authors could check the above suggestions with the editor before the revision actions.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84778

**Title:** Excision of malignant and pre-malignant rectal lesions by transanal endoscopic microsurgery in patients under 50 years of age

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05774529

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FASCRS, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Deputy Director

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-23 23:36

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-31 13:46

**Review time:** 7 Days and 14 Hours

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance   |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <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 |
| <b>Conclusion</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection          |
| <b>Re-review</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  |
| <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

Thanks for invite me to review this manuscript. This study aims to investigate TEM outcomes in patients under 50 years of age. 1. Why is the population under the age of 50 selected as the research sample? Any references? 2. Please revise the format of tables 3. Is there postoperative evaluation of anal function? 4. For T1, what is the criteria of salvage surgery?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84778

**Title:** Excision of malignant and pre-malignant rectal lesions by transanal endoscopic microsurgery in patients under 50 years of age

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03822338

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACS, MBBS, MNAMS, MS

**Professional title:** Professor, Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-21 02:28

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-02 22:20

**Review time:** 12 Days and 19 Hours

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance   |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <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 |
| <b>Conclusion</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection          |
| <b>Re-review</b>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  |
| <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

Dear Authors,    Congratulations for coming up with a nice article. It will however need soem amount of language editing before in can be accepted. Please find the suggestion the comment box