

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 85374

Title: New objective scoring system to clinically assess fecal incontinence

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06313495

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-29 21:23

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-05 19:49

Review time: 5 Days and 22 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input 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
Peer-reviewer statements	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 present manuscript aims to develop a new scoring system (NSS) for FI that is accurate, comprehensive, and easy to use.. It is have a good potential for publication. However, several comments should be addressed in MAJOR REVISION as follows. 1. Why should six FI parameters have identified? Any reasons? 2. Please giving in brief explanation about “anxiety” in concept. Relevant reference encouraged to adopted as follows, doi: 10.3390/bioengineering9020048 and 10.3390/bioengineering9040157 3. The basis of disability score should be given. 4. What is the meaning for A pilot test? Clarify it. 5. Giving the rationalisation why only two sample used for ANOVA test? 6. State the present article limitations before conclusion section. 7. The novel of the present submitted article is not clear. Many published literature has been widely studied in the past. Further explanation in the introduction section in advance is mandatory.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 85374

Title: New objective scoring system to clinically assess fecal incontinence

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06144658

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-30 09:39

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-01 00:57

Review time: 1 Day and 15 Hours

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
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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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
Peer-reviewer statements	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

A new scoring system for FI was formulated, which was simple, logical, comprehensive, and easy to use. The perceptions of patients and surgeons regarding the severity of different FIs did not correlate much. It has some potential for clinical research, however, there are still some issues. Comments: 1. Since this is merely a single-center study, there needs to be an increase in the quantity of clinical cases because they are now quite few. 2. The subjective evaluation of patients has excessive influence, which can lead to the deviation of the results. Whether it can be quantified more specifically and reduce the interference of subjective factors.