

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84413

Title: Systematic review of diagnostic tools for peritoneal metastasis in gastric cancer – staging laparoscopy and its alternatives

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05569322

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-22 02:27

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-25 02:09

Review time: 2 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

1: Despite the risks and high costs of laparoscopic exploration, the results of this study do not seem to change the gold standard status of laparoscopic exploration. So, what is the clinical significance of this study? 2: As mentioned by the author in the limitations section, some of the relevant literature included are highly heterogeneous, and some are insufficient in quantity. Therefore, the error in this study may be relatively large.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84413

Title: Systematic review of diagnostic tools for peritoneal metastasis in gastric cancer – staging laparoscopy and its alternatives

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05469117

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Chief Physician, Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-12

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-01 12:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-01 18:19

Review time: 5 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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
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

Thank you for inviting me to evaluate the Systematic Reviews titled “ Systematic review of diagnostic tools for peritoneal metastasis in gastric cancer – staging laparoscopy and its alternatives”.In this systematic review, they compared computed tomography(CT), positron emission tomography(PET), magnetic resonance imaging(MRI), and radiomic models based on CT and PET to staging laparoscopies were filtered out from the Cochrane Library,EMBASE, PubMed, and Web of Science , and found staging laparoscopy was unequivocally superior to CT in all measured aspects but its risks and costs were not accounted for. Then MRI and PET yielded equivocal results, with the former shown to be only marginally better than CT. Radiomic modelling seems to have the potential to become a promising alternative for peritoneal metastases prediction.The information in this review is helpful to clinical communities. The paper is well arranged and the logic is clear, and the provided figure and tables are well composed and understandable. The quality of language of the manuscript is quite acceptable for me. So, I recommend that this manuscript may be accepted after minor revision. There are some advices for the authors: 1) In this review, you discussed the



**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>

contents of the radiomics, why did you not involve new imaging technologies such as PET MRI? 2) Is ultrasound technology promising for evaluating peritoneal metastatic cancer?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84413

Title: Systematic review of diagnostic tools for peritoneal metastasis in gastric cancer – staging laparoscopy and its alternatives

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05751232

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-12

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-26 03:34

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-03 01:32

Review time: 6 Days and 21 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

该论文设计合理，研究目的明确，比较了分期腹腔镜检查与 CT 扫描在腹膜转移诊断中的疗效，发现分期腹腔镜检查明显优于 CT 扫描，具有较好的临床价值。

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84413

Title: Systematic review of diagnostic tools for peritoneal metastasis in gastric cancer – staging laparoscopy and its alternatives

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05569322

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-12

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-17 02:29

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-17 02:36

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good work!