

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 87541

Title: Comprehensive treatment and a rare presentation of Cronkhite–Canada syndrome:
Two case reports and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05445949

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Chief Physician, Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Serbia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-16 07:44

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-16 08:21

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

Lv et al. presented two cases of Cronkheite-Canada syndrome. The topic is interested, the syndrome is rare, not-fully understood. The presentations of cases are in helter-skelter manner and English need to be polished, too. The results of administered Levo-thyroxine treatment are missing. In the Discussion section, when comparing presented cases with literature data, very questionable assertion about Graves disease and negative ATG i ATPOAbs. It is expected to have negative aforementioned antibodies negative, especially in surgically treated patients, but the main clue are TSH receptor antibodies. The text of the manuscript must be improved aiming to be published.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 87541

Title: Comprehensive treatment and a rare presentation of Cronkhite–Canada syndrome:
Two case reports and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05234476

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Doctor, Postdoctoral Fellow, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-29 02:34

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-29 03:26

Review time: 1 Hour

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 report a rare presentation of CCS with hypothyroidism and summarize specifics relative to this presentation quite well. They then take it a step further by describing a different case of CCS where they delineate the importance of hormonal therapy.

1. Please modify the manuscript title to reflect the real nature of your report with regards to hypothyroidism.
2. Please ensure proper formatting of the core tip paragraph.
3. The current structure of the case presentation section detailing both cases is confusing to the reader. Please ensure that case presentation is entirely presented for each case. Example: Case 1 describe the whole case including lab , imaging, surgical path etc. and then move on to case 2.
4. Discussion is excellently written. Current case reports are nicely summarized and findings are compared with presenting cases quite well.
5. Please re-write the conclusion. It seems a bit repetitive.