

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79639

Title: Classification of rectal cancer according to recurrence types - Comparison of Japanese guidelines and Western guidelines

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03017840

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-05 08:53

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-13 04:56

Review time: 7 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

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 original findings of this manuscript was that " There was no difference in the classification of colorectal cancer between Japan and western countries." The method and conclusion were very simple, but they were not dadequately described. The manuscript was not well organized. A lot of language and grammar was not accurate and appropriate.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79639

Title: Classification of rectal cancer according to recurrence types - Comparison of Japanese guidelines and Western guidelines

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06393261

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Clinical Assistant Professor (Honorary)

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-28 21:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-29 21:42

Review time: 1 Day

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

Dear Sir/Mme, I read with interest your Manuscript: "Classification of rectal cancer according to recurrence types - Comparison of Japanese guidelines and Western guidelines". First of all, I congratulate you for the effort you gave for this study. Some remarks, should be conducted to further improve your work. 1) The objectives mentioned in the abstract are not consistent with the title and the rest of the article, although these objectives are well explained in the main text. The comparison with colon cancer must also be mentioned in the abstract as an objective of the study, as it is in the main text. 2) The right colon normally includes the cecum, the ascending colon, the hepatic flexure and the right transverse colon. The left colon normally includes the left transverse colon, the splenic flexure and the sigmoid. The junction between the right colon and the left colon is located opposite the middle colonic artery. The right colon and the left colon are two different anatomical entities, with different vascularization, different molecular biology and different long-term behavior. In your study, you considered left transverse colon as right colon, which may distort your result. So I think the comparison between these different segments, as you have defined it, invalid. But it remains so by comparing the rectum versus the colon. 3) There are a few typos to correct (repeated words)