

December 27, 2021

Dear editor,

Please find attached files of revised manuscript in word format

Title: Comparison of clinical efficacy and postoperative inflammatory response between laparoscopic and open radical resection of colorectal cancer

Author: Longhai He¹, Bo Yang², Xiaoqin Su³, Yue Zhou⁴, Zhen Zhang⁵

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 70828

First of all, thank you for your careful guidance of this article. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer:

Reviewer: 06058861

The topic of this work is interesting. In this manuscript, a total of 96 patients with colorectal cancer were selected and divided into the study group and the control group to explore and discuss clinical efficacy and postoperative inflammatory response of laparoscopic and open radical resection of colorectal cancer. The perioperative conditions, inflammatory response index levels before and after operation, pain stress response indices and the incidence of the complications between the two groups were counted. They finally concluded that laparoscopic radical resection of colorectal cancer can reduce surgical trauma, reduce inflammatory response, and pain stress response caused by surgical treatment, which is conducive to shorten the rehabilitation process of patients with a low incidence of complications and safety. The tables help the readers to make a more understanding of the study. The whole manuscript is well drafted. The reviewer has no comments.

Reviewer: 06081549

The article with the title "Comparison of clinical efficacy and postoperative inflammatory response between laparoscopic and open radical resection of colorectal cancer" is in generally well done. 1. Title reflect the main subject of

the manuscript; 2. Abstract is good (it summarizes and reflect the work described in manuscript); 3. Key words is ok; 4 Background is adequate; 5. Methods: It was not described how many patients initially selected were excluded. Were all admitted patients selected? 6. Results are ok; 7. Discussion: ok; 8 Illustrations and tables: ok; 9 Biostatistics.: ok; Units used: ok; 10. References: ok. 11. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Language and grammar are appropriated. 12. The manuscript met the requirements of ethics.

Thank you for your advice.

After receiving the comments, we read the article carefully and found some small loopholes in the language of the article and made modifications. We explained the question regarding the initial selection of patients.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

Sincerely Yours,

Longhai He