



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73472

Title: Roxadustat for treatment of anemia in a cancer patient with end-stage renal disease: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05382551

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-23

Reviewer chosen by: Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-05 07:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-05 07:20

Review time: 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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



**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-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 article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with an interesting topic. It's well written, and it's easy to read. The experiment is well designed and shows original and interesting results. However, to be accepted it should be improved in some aspects:

a) The state of the art should be extended because it does not exist. b) It should be structured and organized in the standard sections: introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion and conclusions. c) In the discussion section, the presented work should be compared with other similar ones to establish the advances and limitations of the presented work. d) The conclusions should summarize the scientific contribution of the work and establish a set of lines of future work.