



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

**Manuscript NO:** 66842

**Title:** Laparoscopic vs open surgery in ileostomy reversal of Crohn's disease: A retrospective study

**Reviewer's code:** 00503883

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Medical Assistant

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-29 15:50

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-08 12:39

**Review time:** 8 Days and 20 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Article addresses a remarkably interesting issue. Well-designed study despite retrospective data with rigorous statistical analysis. Adequate selection of patients with a good number and quality of data. Excellent quality images, tables, and adequate literature review. Minor grammatical errors.