

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 76847

Title: Factors associated with hypertension remission after gastrectomy for gastric cancer patients

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00536689

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-03 05:34

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-03 05:42

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting study analyzing a very peculiar aspect after stomach cancer surgery. The introduction is well written. The materials and methods are exhaustive. The results paragraph is not very exhaustive. I would describe the findings obtained more carefully. The tables are explanatory. The discussion appears to be of adequate length with little discussion of the results obtained and comparison with the findings of the literature. Reporting the literature data in a table does not seem to me to be exhaustive. I invite the authors to review the manuscript.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 76847

Title: Factors associated with hypertension remission after gastrectomy for gastric cancer patients

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05548742

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-05 04:00

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-15 07:57

Review time: 10 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

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	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this paper, the authors present the predictive factor for hypertension remission one year after gastrectomy of gastric cancer patients and a risk model for hypertension remission. Overall, the data of the manuscript are clearly presented. The manuscript is interesting, and the data support the main conclusions. However, there are several concerns regarding this study that the authors need to clarify. The present manuscript represents a more limited advance than the previous paper published. Listed below are my specific comments. 1. The authors previously reported data 6 months after surgery. How much does it make sense to present data for the first year after surgery, not too long after that? The author should state a little more firmly how much the evaluation after one year, which is hard to say long-term, is meaningful. Considering the entry period of the target patients, I think there are cases where the course of several years can be observed. Are you considering cases that have been followed up for a longer period of time rather than a few months difference? Not a little, I think the word "long" is not appropriate for this paper. Also, compared to the 6-month report, I think that the novelty including the conclusion is poor. 2. In this manuscript, the decrease in blood pressure is classified into three groups and examined. The Remission group is supposed to be lower than before surgery, but how much blood pressure was actually improved? In the 6-month data report, the number of improvements in blood pressure was also defined and the effect was judged. Were there any improvements that could contribute to the onset and prognosis of complications? If possible, I think it is better to present specific values for changes in blood pressure. And if the drug has been discontinued, how often has it been discontinued? I think that the data on the drug was also examined more



concretely when the 6-month data was reported. 3. What are your thoughts on specific uses as onco-metabolic surgery? What kind of surgery do you think is best if your goal is to lower blood pressure and cure stomach cancer? I don't think it is possible to perform total gastrectomy in all cases. I think it is better to show concretely how to think about adaptation of surgery. However, I do not feel strongly that the authors must respond to my comment.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 76847

Title: Factors associated with hypertension remission after gastrectomy for gastric cancer patients

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03769068

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-04 19:16

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-18 06:20

Review time: 13 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a study with a specific perspective and important findings on the topic. The text is well structured and the methodology seems to be adequate. The language is satisfactory. Moreover, the subject is addressed clearly. However, some points can be improved. First, the molecular mechanisms that justify the remission of hypertension after gastrectomy for patients with gastric cancer can be described in more depth. Second, the usefulness of the study findings for clinical and surgical practice, as well as the implications of these findings for the future of medicine, should be presented at the conclusion of the article.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 76847

Title: Factors associated with hypertension remission after gastrectomy for gastric cancer patients

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05548742

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-03

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-29 00:19

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-30 10:42

Review time: 1 Day and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous





statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have responded appropriately to my concerns. I'm satisfied with the revisions that have been made by the authors. The manuscript is well written, and the results are clearly presented.