

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5975

**Title:** Personalized surgical management of colorectal cancer

**Reviewer code:** 00058523

**Science editor:** Cui, Xue-Mei

**Date sent for review:** 2013-09-30 14:43

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-04 16:19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Y] Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> ] Existed	<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"/> ] No records	<input type="checkbox"/> ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> ] Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> ] Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> ] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> ] No records	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this. As a whole, I do not think there are major areas of concern. Minor points 1. You should set out the outline from the start e.g. we will discuss rehabilitation, ERA etc. As it stands, it is very difficult to anticipate what the authors are going to discuss next, and gives the impression of poor organisation 2. The paragraphing is poor. There are multiple sections where at least 3 paragraphs are required to divide discussion 3. I would perhaps have organised the paper a little differently, but this is not major criticism. All in all, a good effort. I would be grateful if you could provide an outline at the beginning, describing in order the topics you wish to discuss. Split your discussions into shorter paragraphs. Although the review is overly long, I can see reason to include most of this

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5975

**Title:** Personalized surgical management of colorectal cancer

**Reviewer code:** 00068211

**Science editor:** Cui, Xue-Mei

**Date sent for review:** 2013-09-30 14:43

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-14 16:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This literature review analysis and summary 143 references, and draw a conclusion that personalized care for the patient is the true essence of Medicine. Sufficient evidence and rational argumentation are the highlights of this article.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5975

**Title:** Personalized surgical management of colorectal cancer

**Reviewer code:** 00008369

**Science editor:** Cui, Xue-Mei

**Date sent for review:** 2013-09-30 14:43

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-16 10:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have excellent submission with very good points of clinical interests regarding geriatric consideration of CRC surgery. However, the current title is personalized surgical management of colorectal cancer in the elderly population, but the contents were somewhat mixing together of two points of views, geriatric consideration and personalized medicine. Therefore, the current review should be reorganized into three part, one is geriatric consideration focusing, the second personalized medicine aspect, and lastly, as seen in title of talk, two points imparting clinical implication in this point of view. Second point is that though the authors subcategorized under the subtitles, but the contents within is somewhat looking general. Describe the core point of opinion as well as reference review consistent with subtitle, current is too diffuse.