

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10719

**Title:** Complete laparoscopic resection of the rectum using natural orifice specimen extraction

**Reviewer code:** 01558248

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-16 16:06

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-09 14:55

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"/> Existing	<input checked="" 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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The format of abstract need to correct. 2. The last sentence of the abstract needed to change as ....In such a situation, natural orifice specimen extraction (NOSE) have been reported as less invasive surgeries in order to solve the problems arising from small incisions. 3. "Finding" and "Interpretation" were not adequate in the section abstract. 4. It is better to tell us the year and author of beginning of this procedure "natural orifice specimen extraction (NOSE) method. 5. In the last paragraph,it is better to format as " In conclusion, ...." instead of independent paragraphy.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10719

**Title:** Complete laparoscopic resection of the rectum using natural orifice specimen extraction

**Reviewer code:** 01441415

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-16 16:06

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-10 22:29

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript by Hisada et al. reported the detailed surgical procedures and benefits of laparoscopic rectal surgery with NOSE technique. This method as advanced minimally invasive surgery seems to be quite attractive and can be a high position among previously reported NOSE techniques. However, this manuscript involves several concerns to be dissolved before acceptance for publication. Although, the good indication for this technique is discussed in the "Discussion", the authors did not described target illness and detailed actual indication for this technique in the section of "Patients and surgical techniques". It is strongly recommended. Did the authors obtain an approval from ethical committee for the application of this pilot procedure and study in the author's institution? If drawing the resected bowel extracorporeally was impossible or critical damage of residual rectum was occurred during the drawing, what is the salvage procedure and the salvage is predefined before starting this study? Although, the authors reported a favorable result of this method in terms of dissemination of bacteria in pelvic cavity, this issue is still major concern. What kind of bowel preparation was applied for included patients? Furthermore, 500ml of saline with povidone-iodine was used for rectal washout in this study, but the amount seems to be small in the prevention of cancer implantation and infection. I recommend referring Maeda's study (Maeda, et al. Dis Colon Rectum 2004;47; 1706).

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10719

**Title:** Complete laparoscopic resection of the rectum using natural orifice specimen extraction

**Reviewer code:** 00068215

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-16 16:06

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-12 16:35

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"/> Existing	<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		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled "Complete laparoscopic resection of the rectum using natural orifice specimen extraction" presented a new surgical approach for rectal cancer comparing the results with laparoscopic conventional method. Some minor comments: The authors should underline the inclusion and exclusion criteria for natural orifice specimen extraction. The authors should include the informed consent form of the patients for this approach