PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 67631

Title: Current and future role of three-dimensional modelling technology in rectal cancer surgery: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05489618

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-29 04:10

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-04 07:39

Review time: 5 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I had reviewed the manuscript entitled "Current and future role of three-dimensional modelling technology in rectal cancer surgery: A systematic review" by Przedlacka et al. This manuscript deals with the systematic review on 3D modelling technology for applications of rectal cancer surgery. The systematic review is scientifically sound and well conducted and the discussions   are appropriate. However, in my opinion, the following points should be considered before publication: (a) Missing citation are detected in Introduction. For example, para 1 line 2-12, para 2 line 5-9. In my opinion, citation is needed for such important points to avoid biasness in writing.   (b) I suggest author to add another new section to explain in details the general processes and mechanisms for constructing the 3D model or images for application of rectal cancer surgery.   (c) Section of Results (from 1. feasibiility of application of 3D modeling technology until 4. Surgical device design),   throughout the text, it looks like a list of previous studies. No critical comments on literature are done by the authors. I suggest author to compare the advantages and drawbacks of previous studies and give some critical comments on the methodology and results of previous studies.   For me, this is one of the major weakness of this manuscript. (d)   Addition of figures from previous studies would make the manuscript more interesting.   (e) Section of discussion, Lack of discussion on future direction of three-dimensional modelling technology in rectal cancer surgery. I suggest authors to add recommendation on improvements of 3D modelling and printing for rectal cancer surgery.   (f) The conclusion is very weak and should be a little more detailed. Please rewrite it to reflect the content of current study. Consequently it is recommended that the manuscript is returned to the authors for major revision before being accepted in World Journal of Gastroenterology