



**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>

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 86550

**Title:** Effect of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy on related variables of obesity complicated with polycystic ovary syndrome

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07746280

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-08-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-09 09:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-18 09:54

**Review time:** 9 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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

<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 <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) <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

The authors made a retrospective analysis, and used the data to explore the effect of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy on related variables of patients with polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS). After reasonable selecting the time points for observation before and 1 month, 3 months, 6 months and 12 months after operation, the authors showed that the anthropometric indexes, such as body weight and body mass index of all patients were lower than those before operation. The authors also found that 27 patients returned to normal, and 6 patients who intended to become pregnant became pregnant within 1 year after surgery. In short, the topic of this manuscript is timely and interesting. The authors have organized the manuscript rationally, with good methodology and well-written English. However, some important editing needs to be done before publication:

- Although the authors have compared the body mass index of patients before and after the surgery, this study still lacks sufficient comparison to demonstrate the advantages of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy. The authors can add more comparison between laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy and other therapeutic methods in the Introduction part.
- All the abbreviation should appear along with the full name at the first time. For

example, the “EWL” in the Results part. • The authors should provide the ethical statement in the manuscript.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 86550

**Title:** Effect of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy on related variables of obesity complicated with polycystic ovary syndrome

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07746567

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-08-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-11 01:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-21 08:06

**Review time:** 10 Days and 6 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <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) <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

Recently, PCOS is a common endocrine disease in young women, with a prevalence rate of 5-18%, which is closely related to obesity and can significantly affect the metabolic, endocrine and reproductive functions of patients. To address this challenge, in this study, the authors aimed at to evaluating the therapeutic efficacy of LSG on women with polycystic ovary syndrome. The authors used primary clinical data, surgical method, observation index, and statistical analysis to verify their hypothesis. The results showed that LSG can improve hyperandrogenemia and irregular menstruation in obese patients with polycystic ovary syndrome, significantly lose weight and improve a series of complications related to polycystic ovary syndrome. So, in my opinion, this paper is well-written. The experimental design is reasonable, and the results reflects the conclusion as well. I recommend its acceptance after the minor revision. The detailed comments are: 1) In the section of Background, the authors claimed that the efficacy and mechanism of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy (LSG) for obesity with PCOS are unclear. Since this paper only focused on the efficacy of LSG, this sentence is somehow exaggerated and should be rephrased. 2) It is better for the authors to add a table of Basic

Data of the patients in this retrospective analysis, including their ages, marital status, and so on. 3) There are some confusing expressions in this paper. For instance, “it was found that the menstrual cycle of 27 patients (nasty 27) returned to normal, and 6 patients (18%) who intended to become pregnant became pregnant within 1 year after surgery.” I wonder if the 6 patients are included in the 27 patients or not?