

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71394

Title: Significance of dysplasia in bile duct resection margin in patients with extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: A retrospective analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06130469

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-07 03:30

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-11 09:32

Review time: 4 Days and 6 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, the authors reported their experience and their data in the field of resected cholangiocarcinoma. The title is informative and so is the abstract and the keywords. The text is written in a clear way. I have some concerns about the reproducibility of data and the limitation of the study. Were the margins examined by the same anatomopathologist? What was done in case of doubts? Additionally the post-surgery strategy was different(chemio, radio and there is no information about the length of post-surgery treatment) this aspect should be considered in the statistical analysis or at least considered as a limitation of the study. This article has some credit, however, the limitation of this study should be more complete.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71394

Title: Significance of dysplasia in bile duct resection margin in patients with extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: A retrospective analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04123904

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-21 10:17

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-21 11:28

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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this retrospective study, the authors evaluated the prognostic significance of dysplasia-positive margins in patients with extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma (EHCC). They concluded that HGD/CIS margin in resected EHCC was associated with poor survival but LGD-positive resection margin was not a significant indicator for the survival of patients with EHCC. This is a well-written article but has some issues to be addressed. Minor comments: 1) The authors mentioned that LGD positive resection margin in elderly patients could be reasonable to judge it as negative resection margin considering old age and HGD/CIS were independent factors associated with poor survival for patients with EHCC. However, the authors should provide more suggestions about how to manage the postoperative patients with EHCC based on the resection margin status. For example, do the authors think that the adjuvant chemotherapy and/or radiation should be given to the patients with HGD/CIS margins?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71394

Title: Significance of dysplasia in bile duct resection margin in patients with extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: A retrospective analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05367264

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-22 13:36

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-02 14:00

Review time: 10 Days

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 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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is of good quality. It retrospectively analyzes the prognostic significance of extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma patients with resection margin dysplasia, and proposes that LGD positive resection margin is not an important indicator of the survival of EHCC patients. It is a very meaningful retrospective analysis. The paper will be great addition to existing literature. Some questions were asked to the author: 1: It is recommended to add relevant data of patients with preoperative drainage. 2: I would like the authors to read the STROBE Statement and prepare the manuscript according to the STROBE Statement. 3: The author did not provide an approved funding application form. Please upload the grant application form or related approval documents.