

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: I read with great interest the Manuscript titled “Clinical effect of laparoscopic radical resection of colorectal cancer based on propensity score matching”, which falls within the aim of World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery. In my honest opinion, the topic is interesting and the retrospectively studies novel enough to attract the readers’ attention. Nevertheless, the authors should clarify some points and improve the discussion citing relevant and novel key articles about the topic. SPECIFIC COMMENTS: Discussion section needs to supplement the direction of the next study.

Answer: We have added directions for future research in the discussion section. Performing large sample sizes, multi-centre, and high-quality prospective studies is the opposite direction of our future research.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Thank you very much for asking me to review this manuscript by Liu Y et al. The study retrospectively analyzed the clinical data of 100 patients undergoing radical resection of colorectal cancer and compared the clinical effects of open surgery and laparoscopic surgery in terms of perioperative parameters, inflammatory response, immune function, pain degree and physical condition. The findings are well detailed. They found that compared with open surgery, laparoscopic radical resection of CRC showed better early inflammatory, immune, and pain indicators, and better physical status one month after surgery. The result of the study is of interest and may help analyze the early clinical effects of laparoscopic radical resection for CRC. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. Research is well conducted, and statistics is appropriate. The message of the manuscript supported by the results. Furthermore, minor comment that I would to proposed: -Introduction can add more to the presentation of the propensity score matching. -Discussion paragraph could be expanded to underline the strength of this study and the potential limitations. Also, directions for future research could be discussed.

Answer: We have added an introduction to PSM in the Introduction section. In the discussion section, we also add the advantages of using PSM analysis and summarize some limitations and future research directions.