



**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>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Peer review: Authors describe a case report where Toripalimab Combined with Targeted Therapy and Chemotherapy improved the perioperative management of gastric carcinoma. "Herein, we report a case in which pathologic complete response was achieved by neoadjuvant administration of toripalimab" better wording would be "complete pathologic response" "We hope that this case will provide a referable neoadjuvant therapy for gastric carcinoma" anecdotal evidence usually is not enough for practice changing guidelines, the above date in the to be reworded "At the time, the patient was in a good condition and no disease progression was noted" what is the follow-up time? "Introduction" is way too long for a case report with historical information about the treatment strategies. Authors should focus on the salient features that the readers need to be aware of before describing the pertinent case report. A lot of the material from introduction can be used under the discussion portion. "the patient (Mr. Yu)" this is absolutely unnecessary. "Under no obvious predisposing cause" poor starting sentence for a case report. Authors should provide demographic information of the patient with relevant medical comorbidities before presenting the current illness (case report). Timeline is well presented, consider using a timeline graph with to save on the word count. "Furthermore, chemotherapy promotes the expression of PD-1/PD-L1 through a variety of signaling pathways. Therefore, chemotherapy combined with PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor can improve the tumor microenvironment as well as immune tolerance and immunosuppression; thus, an effective and persistent antitumor immune response can be maintained. " Is there in-vitro data to support that statement? This is lofty. Authors can present a hypothesis but in the absence of evidence

statements such as this are unwarranted. Discussion needs to be focused on the current case report instead of presenting a review of literature. Make it more focused.

Thanks very much for your valuable comments.

- “Herein, we report a case in which pathologic complete response was achieved by neoadjuvant administration of toripalimab” better wording would be “complete pathologic response” -the phrase “pathologic complete response” is generally used in this case so we did not revise.
- “We hope that this case will provide a referable neoadjuvant therapy for gastric carcinoma” anecdotal evidence usually is not enough for practice changing guidelines, the above date in the to be reworded -we revised accordingly.
- “At the time, the patient was in a good condition and no disease progression was noted” what is the follow-up time? -we filled in the follow-up time.
- “Introduction” is way too long for a case report with historical information about the treatment strategies. Authors should focus on the salient features that the readers need to be aware of before describing the pertinent case report. A lot of the material from introduction can be used under the discussion portion. -we revised accordingly.
- “the patient (Mr. Yu)” this is absolutely unnecessary. -we revised accordingly.
- “Under no obvious predisposing cause” poor starting sentence for a case report. -we revised accordingly.
- Authors should provide demographic information of the patient with relevant medical comorbidities before presenting the current illness (case report). -we revised accordingly.
- Timeline is well presented, consider using a timeline graph with to save on the word count. -we revised accordingly, see Figure 3.



**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>

- “Furthermore, chemotherapy promotes the expression of PD-1/PD-L1 through a variety of signaling pathways. Therefore, chemotherapy combined with PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor can improve the tumor microenvironment as well as immune tolerance and immunosuppression; thus, an effective and persistent antitumor immune response can be maintained. “ Is there in-vitro data to support that statement? This is lofty. Authors can present a hypothesis but in the absence of evidence statements such as this are unwarranted. -we revised accordingly.
- Discussion needs to be focused on the current case report instead of presenting a review of literature. Make it more focused. -we revised accordingly.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Figures should be included.

Thanks very much for your valuable comments. We already uploaded our figures to the journal.



**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

Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2

Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?

Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yrs 4

Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods

(e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes

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?

Yes 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? Yes 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the

figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the

paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?

No Figure 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?

No statistics 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units?

Yes 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? 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? 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? Yes 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? Yes Manuscript Peer-Review Yes Specific Comments To Authors:* Please make your specific comments/suggestions to authors based on the above-listed criteria checklist for new manuscript peer-review and the below-listed criteria for comments on writing. The criteria for writing comments include the following three features: First, what are the original findings of this manuscript? What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through experiments in this study? Authors have presented a schedule for neo adjuvant chemotherapy for carcinoma stomach. Second, what are the quality and importance of this manuscript? What are the new findings of this study? What are the new concepts that this study proposes? What are the new methods that this study proposed? Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided? What are the unique insights that this study presented? What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? Nil Third, what are the limitations of the study and its findings? What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript? What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next? How might this publication

impact basic science and/or clinical practice? Nil Please fill-in your specific comments to the authors below: Minor grammatical errors pointed out in the file returned mat be incorporated and resubmitted.

Thanks very much for your valuable comments. We already revised accordingly.