



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 88851

Title: Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection vs Transanal Endoscopic Surgery for Rectal Tumors: A systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03768526

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-13

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-17 10:25

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-25 17:33

Review time: 8 Days and 7 Hours

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 Grade E: Do not publish |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" 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 authors performed a meta-analysis for the safety and efficacy between endoscopic submucosal dissection and transanal endoscopic surgery for rectal tumors. It has been a long time since both techniques were developed, their characteristics are well understood, and, likely, many practitioners have already used them correctly. Therefore, there may have been no difference in comparing the two techniques in this study. However, these results are helpful for planning future treatment strategies, and the value of this paper is high. If there is one disappointing point, it is that there is a difference in the method of anesthesia between the two procedures. I would like you to add this point to the discussion.