



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Surgical Procedures

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13101

**Title:** Prophylactic oophorectomy during primary colorectal cancer resection: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02444698

**Reviewer's country:** Bangladesh

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-06 18:08

**Date reviewed:** 2014-08-15 14:32

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

Well done



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Surgical Procedures  
**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13101  
**Title:** Prophylactic oophorectomy during primary colorectal cancer resection: A systematic review and meta-analysis  
**Reviewer’s code:** 02906811  
**Reviewer’s country:** China  
**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian  
**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-06 18:08  
**Date reviewed:** 2014-08-20 21:32

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

In this study, the authors performed a systematic review and meta-analysis on the association between prophylactic oophorectomy during primary colorectal cancer resection and risk of local recurrence and overall 5-year mortality. Rationale and aim for conducting this meta-analysis on this topic are clear. However I have several concerns as follow: 1 Methods: Data synthesis and analysis “A HR of less than 1.00 represented worse survival for the experimental group (for example oophorectomy) versus the control group (no oophorectomy).” We should say : “A HR of more than 1.00 represented worse survival ... ..” or “ A HR of less than 1.00 represented better survival ... ..”, when compared the oophorectomy group with the control group (no oophorectomy). 2 Results: Study selection “There were 4 studies<sup>6,15,16,17</sup> that could be included in the quantitative synthesis... ..” In this sentence, there is a mistake in citation, it should be “There were 4 studies<sup>6, 14,15,16... ..”.</sup>