



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 80653

**Title:** Local recurrence after successful endoscopic submucosal dissection for rectal mucinous mucosal adenocarcinoma: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06215370

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-08

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-08 12:41

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-08 14:06

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Thanks for sharing such an interesting case, but I have one question: The authors mentioned that the pathological result was mucinous adenocarcinoma with signet-ring cell carcinoma after the first rectal ESD procedure, and "Mucinous adenocarcinomas with signet-ring cell carcinomas are distinctively different from adenocarcinoma in their tumor biology and aggressive phenotype[5]". When the follow-up colonoscopy revealed possible recurrence, Why was EUS not performed for preoperative evaluation, such as the presence or absence of submucosal invasion? If EUS was performed as in most conditions, the Mile's operation might have been directly advised instead of the unnecessary second ESD procedure.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 80653

**Title:** Local recurrence after successful endoscopic submucosal dissection for rectal mucinous mucosal adenocarcinoma: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03604107

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Albania

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-08

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-08 19:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-10 17:11

**Review time:** 1 Day and 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

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

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

It is a good paper, with an important theme. The language is good and details are convincing. I have nevertheless a major perplexity with regard to this paper: a case report cannot have 16 (sixteen) authors ! Maybe I have counted wrong; otherwise please clarify the role of each author (what contribution) to the editorial office.