



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 49195

Title: Oral chemotherapy for second-line treatment in patients with gemcitabine-refractory advanced pancreatic cancer

Reviewer’s code: 03706560

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-05-23 13:31

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-23 14:18

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read the manuscript “Oral chemotherapy for second-line treatment in patients with gemcitabine-refractory advanced pancreatic cancer with interesting. This is a well-written retrospective analysis and I have made some comments to improve the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

manuscript. Introduction: The information is good. However, need some minor English review. Methods: Well done. Unfortunately, the number of included patients is very small. If it is possible, would be great to include more patients from other institutions and made a multicenter retrospective study. Results: The results showed similar efficacy. However, the capecitabine group had significant more hand-foot syndrome than S-1 group. If the author's need to recommend one treatment. Which one they will recommend? Please include this in the discussion. Discussion: Author's should discuss their limitations in detail, such as retrospective design and small number of patients. Conclusion: Well done. I think the higher number of hand-foot syndrome in the capecitabine group should be included in the conclusion.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 49195

Title: Oral chemotherapy for second-line treatment in patients with gemcitabine-refractory advanced pancreatic cancer

Reviewer’s code: 02445626

Reviewer’s country: China

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-05-23 19:25

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-29 23:04

Review time: 6 Days and 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. In the introduction section, the authors states that “To date, there is no standard guideline for second-line treatment of gemcitabine-refractory pancreatic cancer patients with poor performance status.”. Can they provide a reference to support this statement



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

since this is a key background for the study? Also for “Capecitabine, a prodrug of 5-FU, is one of the most commonly used second-line agents after gemcitabine failure.”? 2.

“S-1 is an another oral drug that is a combination of....”. Since S-1 is a group of drugs, it cannot be called an...drug. 3. The characteristic of patients have been summarized in Table 1, the authors do not need to explain the information in context. 4.

The discussion section should be re-written. The discussion of “immune checkpoint inhibitors” and “molecular targeting drugs.” appears to be too abrupt without linking contexts. Some discussions are not closely related to the study. The authors should focus on discussing the reasons and mechanisms regarding differences in the efficacy and toxicities of capecitabine and S-1.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No