



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 89686

Title: Study on gender differences and potential clinical value of three-dimensional computerized tomography pelvimetry in rectal cancer patients

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06179533

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-09 11:37

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-17 11:35

Review time: 7 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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 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



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 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

The authors addressed an anatomical problem that is important in the surgical approach. I will make a few suggestions to make the article more interesting. 1. Introduction: The type of rectal cancer operations and the importance of pelvic measurements in these operations should be explained in more detail. 2. Introduction: The shortcomings of the studies summarized as 1-5 should be given in more detail. 3. Introduction: Data regarding the number of patients and methodology of the findings should be extracted 4. Discussion: In the first paragraphs, only gynecological operations were mentioned, but the study actually deals with rectal operations. The discussion should be expanded in this direction. 5. Discussion: Study limitations should be presented. In particular, it appears that intraobserver and interobserver variability were not studied during the measurements. This should be explained or added to the limitations.