

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 64098

Title: Neoadjuvant Treatment: A Window Of Opportunity For Nutritional Prehabilitation In Patients With Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 05128663

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Attending Doctor, Postdoc, Research Associate, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-21 16:24

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-13 18:19

Review time: 20 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the authors The article with the title “Neoadjuvant Treatment: A Window Of Opportunity For Nutritional Prehabilitation In Patients With Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma” is in generally well done, but I would offer these comments to the investigators: 1) Some minor grammatical errors occur. The manuscript contains significant language-related issues. Please correct these types of grammatical errors throughout the paper. 2) Several words throughout the manuscript appear to be merged. Please correct it. 3) A short paragraph about the current treatment options would be useful. 4) A summarized table about the subsection of “NUTRITIONAL MANAGEMENT” (Protein intake, enzyme replacement etc) would be useful. Criteria Checklist 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Answer: YES 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Answer: YES 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Answer: YES 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Answer: Generally YES 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Answer: - 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Answer: - 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper’s scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Answer: - 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the



**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>

figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Answer: some improvements would be useful 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Answer: - 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Answer: - 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Answer: generally YES. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Answer: YES 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 64098

Title: Neoadjuvant treatment: A window of opportunity for nutritional prehabilitation in patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 05128663

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Attending Doctor, Postdoc, Research Associate, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-12

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-21 17:08

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-21 17:22

Review time: 1 Hour

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 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors answered in all of my requests.