

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 04732834

Manuscript ID: **42653**

Manuscript Type: ORIGINAL ARTICLE

TITLE: Post-operative CT scan – Reliable tool for quality assessment of complete mesocolic excision

Editing requests from peer-reviewers:

1. *Resolution of figures 1A-1C must be enhanced*
2. *Figure 2 extends beyond the right hand margin of the page, please correct it.*
3. *There are many digraphs in the manuscript, and it is hard to read. They should be divided.*
4. *Improve the quality of the all images*
5. *Additionally, the authors must present a scale bar for each figure and explain it to all figure legends.*
6. *If possible, survival analysis is better to be added. – Answer from author - not available at the moment*

Explanations for requested modifications:

- We have increased the quality of the ileocolic.png (403 kB) images to .bmp high quality (857 kB); inferior_mesenteric.png (183 kB) to .bmp (342 kB) and IMA_origin.png to .bmp. The only possibility from our knowledge to further increase the quality of the images would be to provide the originals (zoomed out), however then the stumps would be barely visible and multiple redundant details (bowel loops, mesentery etc.) would be in the center.
- We have added a scale bar to each image.
- Figure 2 has been arranged to fit the page.
- All the tables have been arranged to fit the page and the cells have been fitted properly to correspond to the headings –these had been minor language editing post-processing alterations, but we believe the tables are more accesible to reader now. However we have not divided the tables as suggested because, fistly, they have comparison purposes between the groups and secondly, the statistical significance sections are in direct corespondence to the stump measurements. However, if the reviewers would still consider that the tables need more modifications we would modify them.
- At this point, a survival analysis for comparison between the groups is not available, but we are currently following the two cohorts on this purpose.

Editing requests from editing team:

1. *Provide BACKGROUND for the abstract*
2. *Add Audio Core Tip*
3. *Delete blanks across all references*
4. *Review ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS*
5. *Increase quality of images*

Explanations for requested modifications:

- Background has been added within abstract, 95 words (highlighted in yellow).
- Audio Core Tip has been provided as hyperlink to mp3 file and file will be uploaded along with manuscript
- All blanks have been deleted across references
- Article Highlights were reviewed, instructions were reassessed and we updated the sections *Research Methods* and *Research Results* (highlighted in yellow) which weren't written accordingly beforehand.
- Quality of images has been increased to bmp files (high quality). As we aforementioned, the quality is decreased as the images are zoomed-in to clearly view the arterial stumps. To insert the original images would create redundant details so the stumps would be difficult to find by the reader.

Yours sincerely,

Stefan Morarasu

General Surgery

Regional Oncology Institute Iasi, Romania

Grigore T Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy