

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 80665

**Title:** Magnetic resonance imaging-based deep learning model to predict multiple firings in double-stapled colorectal anastomosis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06090125

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Lecturer, Technical Editor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-30 16:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-03 06:04

**Review time:** 3 Days and 13 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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

<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

My Comments and Suggestions to Authors: 1- In my opinion, the abstract is too cumbersome and is hard to catch the key point. The keywords need to be more detailed. 2- In the Introduction part, the new features of the proposed method and the main advantages of the results over others should be clearly described. 3- An introduction should clearly highlight the motivation, problem statement, the objective of the paper, gap in the existing research and the novelty of the conducted research. 4- The contributions presented in this paper are not sufficient for possible publication in this journal. I highly suggest authors to clearly define the contributions. 5- The literature has to be strongly updated with some relevant and recent papers focused on the fields dealt with the manuscript. 6- The proposed method and experiments are not clearly illustrated. 7- The results are not easy to follow. Give more explanation in existing method about result and discussion part. 8- The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Write your conclusions. 9- References aren't formatted according to rules. Additional References: The following articles could be useful: • Has the Future Started? The Current Growth of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Deep Learning. <https://doi.org/10.52866/ijcsm.2022.01.01.013> • Skin cancer disease images classification using deep learning solutions. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-021-10952-7>

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 80665

**Title:** Magnetic resonance imaging-based deep learning model to predict multiple firings in double-stapled colorectal anastomosis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05759436

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Reviewer\_Country

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-07 07:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-07 08:24

**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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**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>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**

This study suggest that clinical or imaging information alone is insufficient to predict the usage of  $\geq 3$  cartridges during surgery and an MRI-based integrated deep learning model might help determine the best anastomotic strategy for mid-low rectal cancer patients. Compared with other similar studies, this study shows obvious advantages and has greater clinical application value.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 80665

**Title:** Magnetic resonance imaging-based deep learning model to predict multiple firings in double-stapled colorectal anastomosis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06025907

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BSc

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Research Assistant, Research Scientist, Teaching Assistant

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-07 00:43

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-16 06:28

**Review time:** 9 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection



**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>Re-review</b>	[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous
<b>statements</b>	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this study, the authors developed a deep learning model based on MRI and could predict multiple firings in double-stapled colorectal anastomosis. The authors did a great job of disseminating their findings. The manuscript is thorough, insightful, and well-written. The authors noted that an ethical committee had approved their work, and they took informed consent from patients. This kind of study is essential to assist doctors in making decisions. Due to the growing number of patients per doctor, it is often challenging for doctors to monitor all test results. The authors analyzed and used data from 328 patients. The inclusion and exclusion criteria were clear. They also compared their work with recent similar studies. The manuscript's structure is decent, but the research gap and the need for this solution need to be more convincing. The study should include more related work on this application and approach. Also, the author did not provide any hypothesis behind choosing the detection model. Finally, authors should use proper citations instead of URLs in the body of the manuscript, and a few minor grammar issues need to be addressed.