

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 88943

Title: Influence of different magnetic forces on the effect of colonic anastomosis in rats

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04898871

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-16

Reviewer chosen by: Huo Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-01 16:37

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-10 13:02

Review time: 8 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Grade A: Excellent [<input type="checkbox"/>] Grade B: Good [<input type="checkbox"/>] Grade C: Fair [<input type="checkbox"/>] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[<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
Conclusion	[<input type="checkbox"/>] Accept (High priority) [<input type="checkbox"/>] Accept (General priority) [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Minor revision [<input 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

Firstly, I would like to congratulate you by trying to add more information on this issue. I consider that your study needs to be slightly improved in some of its parts. I proceed to perform some commentaries for each manuscript section: In the ABSTRACT and CORE TIP: • Some minor changes are suggested in attached MS-Word document modified with Control Panel. In the INTRODUCTION: • Authors only mention the potential effect of magnetic force on the anastomoses. But it seems to be logical than maybe the magnetic force needed could be also related to issues like tissue thickness, oedema, inflammation, • Line 109: authors speak about “credibility”; I believe that this word is maybe too strong, those papers are published and peer reviewed, so its credibility must not be questioned... I suggest to write some like “limit the results or obtained conclusions” or similar. In the MATERIAL AND METHODS section, we can mention: • What does NdFeB means? • Surgical procedure: I don’t understand well the concept “mesangial edge”; Maybe is better to write mesenteric or anti-mesenteric? Were they situated in a colon teniae? • Which one is postoperative analgesics regimen? How were rats euthanized? • Is it possible to add more figures explaining deeply anastomotic

diameter testing? • Concerning histological analyses... Please add information about what parameters were evaluated about anastomotic healing (as examples: collagen amount? Inflammation? Muscle area? Etc...). Were colon layers restituted ad integrum in the anastomotic area? • Other minor changes are suggested in attached MS-Word document modified with Control Panel. RESULTS SECTION: • HISTOLOGY (see previous commentary in M&M): Is it possible to add information related to the situation of the rest of the layers? Submucosa (the most important in anastomosis healing), muscular, etc. • Other minor changes are suggested in attached MS-Word document modified with Control Panel. DISCUSSION SECTION: • I suggest to add to the references and comment these review article in the field or similar: o Diaz R, Davalos G, Welsh LK, Portenier D, Guerron AD. Use of magnets in gastrointestinal surgery. Surg Endosc. 2019 Jun;33(6):1721-1730. doi: 10.1007/s00464-019-06718-w. Epub 2019 Feb 25. PMID: 30805789. o Trujillo Loli Y, Trejo Huamán MD, Campos Medina S, Vega Landa JL, García Pérez R, Targarona Soler EM. Physical Bases, Indications, and Results of the Use of Magnets in Digestive Surgery: A Narrative Review. J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A. 2022 May;32(5):485-494. doi: 10.1089/lap.2021.0314. Epub 2021 Sep 6. PMID: 34492199. • Line 246: I suggest better that “convincing” to use a word like “enough” or “sufficient”,... • Please add more information or explain the study limitations. • Other minor changes are suggested in attached MS-Word document modified with Control Panel. REFERENCES SECTION: • I believe that 16 references are very few for an original research; please consider to add more about magnetic anastomoses or about anastomosis healing. Newly I would like to congratulate authors for their work. Keep working in this way and trying to publish your research.