

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27332

Title: Critical analysis of the literature investigating urogenital function preservation following robotic rectal cancer surgery

Reviewer's code: 00069139

Reviewer's country: Thailand

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-25 11:08

Date reviewed: 2016-06-05 10:55

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

The manuscript is a comprehensive review addressing pelvic functions (rectal and sexual) after robotic surgery. Content coverage is adequate and focus. Language quality and flow of idea are excellent.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27332

Title: Critical analysis of the literature investigating urogenital function preservation following robotic rectal cancer surgery

Reviewer's code: 00505440

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-25 11:08

Date reviewed: 2016-06-08 23:22

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is erroneously listed as an Editorial rather than a systematic review. Please correct this. This is a nicely written manuscript. However, the Figure and Tables need major revisions. In Figure 1, the reasons for excluding the other studies needs to be excluded. Please refer to other systematic reviews to understand this. The Table legends are too brief and uninformative. They need to be elaborated to explain to the reader what is being depicted. There is use the asterisk sign in the tables - the meaning of which is left unexplained. Please avoid using the names of Journals in the columns as has been done in Table 1 Please avoid the use of non-standard abbreviations as the authors have done in every table. It is rather irritating to read! The statements at the end of every table make no sense! Are these abbreviations used in the table? If they are, then the sentence following Table 1 makes no sense. Table 3 must be deleted as it is redundant

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27332

Title: Critical analysis of the literature investigating urogenital function preservation following robotic rectal cancer surgery

Reviewer's code: 00227359

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-05-25 11:08

Date reviewed: 2016-06-11 21:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 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

This study has a clever idea as to whether there was a benefit of robotic rectal resection over the laparoscopic counterpart. The material, method, search and selection of the studies were excellent. However the results part of the study looks like unsatisfying. As systematic review or a meta-analysis the raw data of several trials should be pooled and the cumulative results should be mathematically