



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84201

Title: Prognostic significance of preoperative lymphocyte to monocyte ratio in patients with signet ring gastric cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06520294

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Qatar

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-09 03:36

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-17 08:28

Review time: 8 Days and 4 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written manuscript including presentation of clinical data of signet ring gastric cancer patients in the authors' center and a concise review of the literature on the subject. They assessed the prognosis predictive accuracy of preoperative LMR for signet ring gastric cancer. The findings are not surprising but more or less expected by the available literature on the subject, however the authors present their own experience honestly and with enough details and information provided. Suggestions: There are some minor languages or typing errors which should be corrected with a careful inspection of the manuscript. The tables should appear in prose as they are mentioned in the text.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84201

Title: Prognostic significance of preoperative lymphocyte to monocyte ratio in patients with signet ring gastric cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06520036

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-08 00:37

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-18 00:04

Review time: 9 Days and 23 Hours

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The clinical data of 212 patients with gastric signet ring cell carcinoma were used to evaluate the prognostic accuracy of preoperative LMR LMR by area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC). Although the focus and purpose of their study are intriguing, the submitted manuscript also needs to be modified before it can be published. Introduction section is too long and redundant. Also, study objectives should be shortened and clarified. Instead, the Materials and Methods section is too simple to describe and authors need to list inclusion and exclusion criteria, supplemented by how some important variables were measured. The results are very rich, the author analyzed the clinical data of patients in detail, however, the presentation is not clear, according to the ROC analysis, single factor analysis, multivariate analysis sequence will be clearer. The results were well discussed, but the references should be re-examined and updated.