

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 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>". 3 Table 2 should be re-edited, excess vertical lines and horizontal lines should be removed.