

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 89688

**Title:** Impact of different anastomosis methods on post-recurrence after intestinal resection for Crohn's disease: A meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07916651

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Research Associate, Researcher

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-12-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-12-28 10:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-01-07 02:08

**Review time:** 9 Days and 15 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The abstract presents a well-organized and informative summary of the study comparing Kono-S and traditional anastomosis in Crohn's disease surgery. The background succinctly introduces Crohn's disease and the relevance of anastomosis techniques, providing context for the study. The objectives are clearly outlined, focusing on the impact of Kono-S anastomosis on postoperative outcomes. The methods section is robust, detailing the databases searched, inclusion criteria, and the search strategy. Notably, the inclusion of the PICOS scheme enhances the clarity of the study design. The results section effectively communicates key findings, such as the reduction in hospitalization time and recurrence rates with Kono-S anastomosis. The conclusion appropriately summarizes the study's outcomes, emphasizing the potential benefits of Kono-S anastomosis while acknowledging the need for further research. While the manuscript is well-organized, a slight enhancement in the clarity of each section's purpose, including the background, methods, results, and conclusion, would improve overall coherence. To enhance the study's practical relevance, explicitly emphasizing the clinical implications in the conclusion would be beneficial.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 89688

**Title:** Impact of different anastomosis methods on post-recurrence after intestinal resection for Crohn's disease: A meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07916582

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-12-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-12-26 09:39

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-01-08 23:52

**Review time:** 13 Days and 14 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This meta-analysis delves into the comparison between Kono-S and traditional anastomosis in patients with Crohn's disease post-intestinal resection. The background provides a clear rationale for the study, emphasizing the clinical importance of optimal anastomosis methods. The objectives are explicitly stated, guiding the reader on the study's focus. The methods section is detailed, ensuring transparency and reproducibility. The utilization of search strategies for different databases and adherence to PRISMA guidelines enhance the study's methodological rigor. The results section succinctly communicates the key findings, such as the reduction in hospitalization time and recurrence rates associated with Kono-S anastomosis. The conclusion aptly aligns with the study's outcomes, emphasizing the potential clinical implications of Kono-S anastomosis while maintaining a cautious tone regarding the need for further validation. Overall, this meta-analysis serves as an effective standalone representation of the study, providing valuable insights into the comparative impact of anastomosis techniques in Crohn's disease surgery. Minor comments: 1. The manuscript requires a minor editing. Some minor language polishing should be corrected. 2. Please update the references list.

3. The figures and tables should be improved.