

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25335

Title: Systematic review of laparoscopic vs open surgery for colorectal cancer in elderly patients

Reviewer's code: 02484487

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-07 08:47

Date reviewed: 2016-03-10 18:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Duration of short outcome should be mentioned to be more accurate. 2.No need for too many tables. 3.The tables can be reduced so that the readers attention is maintained. 4.There is lot of repetition of sentences eg in short outcomes amd long outcome.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25335

Title: Systematic review of laparoscopic vs open surgery for colorectal cancer in elderly patients

Reviewer's code: 02954607

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-07 08:47

Date reviewed: 2016-03-16 05:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good review article, scientific and rigorous analysis.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25335

Title: Systematic review of laparoscopic vs open surgery for colorectal cancer in elderly patients

Reviewer's code: 03035478

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-07 08:47

Date reviewed: 2016-03-23 19:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for a nice, concise and comprehensive meta-analysis. Please refer to the few comments in the reviewed PDF manuscript and amend or clarify. Otherwise, the only suggestion for improvement with regard to the imbalance between the written and the pictorial content, would be to condense certain figures and/or tables so that the final copy-edited form of the paper is more comfortable to read.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25335

Title: Systematic review of laparoscopic vs open surgery for colorectal cancer in elderly patients

Reviewer's code: 02554620

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-07 08:47

Date reviewed: 2016-03-23 21:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, Thank you for giving me a chance to review this study. I really appreciate your efforts to contribute the paper. I am review your manuscript : Systematic review of laparoscopic versus open surgery for colorectal cancer in elderly patients. I inform this paper can passed under my authority. Thanks