

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25452

**Title:** Robotic rectal surgery: State of the art

**Reviewer's code:** 00505481

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-15 22:50

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-08 03:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

well done paper: exact, correct, honest. Nice and interesting to read

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25452

**Title:** Robotic rectal surgery: State of the art

**Reviewer's code:** 00030987

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-15 22:50

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-08 13:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read with extreme attention the manuscript. The publication is actual and interesting. The publication is well articulated. The paragraphs are well articulated and exhaustive. The list of the references is exhaustive. The tables are explanatory and complete. I find useless the figure 1.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25452

**Title:** Robotic rectal surgery: State of the art

**Reviewer's code:** 02549363

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-15 22:50

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-26 04:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No new addition to existing literature.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25452

**Title:** Robotic rectal surgery: State of the art

**Reviewer's code:** 00182891

**Reviewer's country:** France

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-15 22:50

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-07 05:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review mainly summarizing authors' studies of robotic rectal surgery. Its very interesting and there is a lot of informations of articles. This review draw a good conclusion

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25452

**Title:** Robotic rectal surgery: State of the art

**Reviewer's code:** 00724342

**Reviewer's country:** Serbia

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-15 22:50

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-07 06:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The overall structure of the manuscript is complete. The scientific question proposed in the manuscript is to present a review of all the literature examining robotic surgery for rectal cancer was performed. This information would be interesting enough to warrant readers' attention Good review, which is based on the analysis of data from the literature. The source of the data that is presented reliable. The conclusions of the manuscript are clearly presented in the Conclusion section. . There is no indication of academic misconduct in the manuscript. The title of the manuscript contain key words, and is the title interesting enough to attract readers' attention The manuscript based upon a summarization of the authors' achievements in their field, does present considerations into some key issues in the field today The topic of the manuscript fall within the scope of WJGO The language of the manuscript should be corrected Conclusions The experiences and lessons presented in the manuscript can improve the readers' practice The content of the manuscript has value for publication The manuscript is clear, comprehensive, and convincing