

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Clinical Study: The Impact of Targeted Fluid Therapy on Volume Management during Enhanced Recovery After Surgery in Gastrointestinal Procedures

Original Research, Acta Biochim. Pol.

Reviewer: Zhibo Qu

Submitted on: 14 Dec 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/abp.2024.12377

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

Goal-directed fluid therapy (GDFT) under enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) concept is helpful to volume management during radical resection of colorectal tumors, with good postoperative recovery.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This study only collected 41 cases of gastrointestinal surgery patients; this experiment involves single center research, but there are too few centers. Hope to conduct multi center research in the next step of the experiment.

Q 3 Please comment on the methods, results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

1. Materials and methods are relatively reasonable and have sufficient content.
2. The results section is relatively simple, please explain the value and significance of the results.

Check List

Q 4 Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List)

1. In the Discussion section, authors should summarize the results separately, not simply list the results, but extract the significance of the summary. Please modify the discussion section.
2. Meanwhile, the discussion section should explain the similarities and differences between the results and conclusions of this study and other studies.
3. Language needs strengthening.

Q 5 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Q 6 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 7 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

Q 8 Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes.

Q 9 Are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?

Yes.

Q 10 Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository? (Sequence/expression data, protein/molecule characterizations, annotations, and taxonomy data are required to be deposited in public repositories prior to publication)

Yes.

Q 11 Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?

Yes.

Q 12 Have standard biosecurity and institutional safety procedures been adhered to?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Originality

☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☐

Q 14 Rigor

☒ ☒ ☒ ☐ ☐

Q 15 Significance to the field

☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☐

Q 16 Interest to general audience

☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☐

Q 17 Quality of the writing

☒ ☒ ☒ ☐ ☐

Q 18 Overall quality of the study

☒ ☒ ☒ ☒ ☐