



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 63073

Title: Clinicopathological features of small T1 colorectal cancers

Reviewer's code: 05775699

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nigeria

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-28 22:34

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-30 15:56

Review time: 1 Day and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have made good attempts at providing insight into what contribution tumor size could make in TI colorectal carcinomas. The study design is adequate and the results are noteworthy. In a broad sense, the discussion section needs to be developed more to harness the important findings of this study. More in-depth discussion is required. Other specific comments are outlined below. comment 1. please recast the statement on lines 85-87. Some words might be missing there. comment 2. The concept of tumor budding described by the authors do not seem to agree with the recent International Tumor budding consensus recommendations. Would the authors be pleased to revise their tumor budding assessment using the current guidelines? comment 3. The first sentence under the discussion section may need revision. please check that. There are few others such as lines 203 and 211. comment 4. The points made from line 224 to 231 would fit more in the methods and results sections. Better still, this whole paragraph can be revised to bring out clearly the authors' intended meaning. comment 5. The conclusion needs revision to make it more constructive. comment 6. Concerning gender as presented on the Tables, only data for males were presented. Is there a reason for this? What is the observation regarding the significant difference in tumor size among males ($p = .03$) on table 2? comment 7. Regarding the figures, the alphabetical annotations were placed above the figures. Please look at that again. comment 8. Figure 2c is a photomicrograph said to be of a well differentiated carcinoma. At this scanning power of the microscope, readers may not be able to discern this. a higher magnification photomicrograph would be appropriate please.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 63073

Title: Clinicopathological features of small T1 colorectal cancers

Reviewer's code: 05487696

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor, Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-28 08:09

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-03 12:23

Review time: 5 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Keywords: 1) Please make sure that the keywords are found in US-NLM at: <https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/MeSHonDemand>

Introduction: The authors demonstrated what is already known about the topic clearly, except for this mentioned paragraph starting with "Recently, the strategy of "resect and discard" has emerged"

2) (Resect and discard) is not always beneficial for patients' care and this issue has been argued in several literatures, so I recommend discussing this point in the discussion section.

Methods: The process of subject selection was clear.

4) Paris classification and Kudo's classification

Histological examination section: 3) Line5: "cut into parallel 2- to 3-mm-thick sections" Kindly make sure that the used measurement unit is 2-3 microns NOT (millimeter) . 4)Line7: "diagnosed on the basis of the World Health Organization" should be; diagnosed on the basis of the 2019 World Health Organization.

Results: 5)Cite the tables properly.

Discussion 6) First paragraph looks repetition, no need for this "In this study, we revealed the clinicopathological features of small T1 CRCs compared with large T1 CRCs. Small T1 CRCs were comparable to large T1 CRCs regarding the rate of LNM, followed by the rate of lymphatic and vascular invasion, tumor differentiation, and tumor budding".

References 7) What is the utility of references number 18 and 19?

All sections 8) Language final revision is advised



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 63073

Title: Clinicopathological features of small T1 colorectal cancers

Reviewer's code: 05487696

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor, Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: Yun-Xiaojian Wu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-04 06:10

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-04 06:18

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Revise the version of (word) program, to make all symbols clear, especially in methods sections



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 63073

Title: Clinicopathological features of small T1 colorectal cancers

Reviewer's code: 05775699

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nigeria

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: Yun-Xiaojian Wu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-04 21:44

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-04 23:54

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Your choice of Japanese tumour budding determination and grading protocol is well respected. All other responses are acceptable too. In the conclusion section, "Therefore, we should determine the requirement for additional surgical resection after endoscopic resection of T1 CRC on the basis of a careful pathological diagnosis, even if it is a small lesion." may read as "Therefore, requirements for additional surgical resection after endoscopic resection of T1 CRC should be determined on the basis of a careful pathological diagnosis, even if it is a small lesion."