Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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 [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the manuscript titled "Immunotherapy for advanced gastric cancer", except for the description of the epidemiology and molecular genetic characteristic of gastric cancer, the authors mainly reviewed the current immunotherapy studies in advanced gastric cancer. However, there are many reviews related to immunotherapy of gastric cancer have been published. The authors only simply described the existing research, but lacked of refined summary, logical thinking and the deep discussion. The organization and presentation of those studies related to PD-1/PD-L1 immunotherapy is poor. It also lacked of the prospects for future strategies. In addition, the abstract could not accurately summarized the content described in the manuscript. Therefore, the significance, the interest and readability of this review is limited.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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 [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article presents a comprehensive discussion of immunotherapy approaches in the context of gastric cancer, including passive immunotherapy with immune checkpoint inhibitors, active immunotherapy with cancer vaccines, and dendritic cell-based therapies. The article also provides a thorough overview of the current state of research in this field, acknowledging the limitations and challenges associated with these approaches. However, there are several weaknesses that need to be addressed before the article is suitable for publication. 1.The article briefly mentions the potential of combining immunotherapies with other treatments, such as chemotherapy, but does not provide a detailed exploration of these approaches or their potential benefits and challenges 2. How about other checkpoint inhibitor, for example Sintilimab, Tislelizumab and CTLA-4 inhibitor? 3.The article could be better organized by grouping studies that evaluate similar treatment regimens together, which would make it easier for readers to compare the findings. For example, the two studies evaluating Avelumab could be discussed consecutively. 4.The article could provide a more in-depth discussion of the clinical implications of the study findings. For example, what do the

results mean for patients and clinicians, and how might they inform future research on Avelumab and Durvalumab in AGC and AGEJC? 5.In the sentence "By encouraging the polarization of less cytotoxic and pro-inflammatory T cell subsets, the tumor microenvironment may compromise anti-tumor immunity," the phrase "less cytotoxic and pro-inflammatory" is unclear. It should be rephrased for clarity, such as "By encouraging the polarization towards less cytotoxic T cell subsets and pro-inflammatory T cell subsets, the tumor microenvironment may compromise anti-tumor immunity." However, with significant revisions to address the weaknesses mentioned above, the article has the potential to provide a valuable contribution to the field of gastric cancer immunotherapy.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 84902

Title: Immunotherapy for advanced gastric cancer

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05618167

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-03 02:58

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-03 03:11

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, Wattana Leowattana and colleagues summarized the current advances of Immunotherapy for advanced gastric cancer. In general, this review is interesting and inspire for readers. I think this review can be published without revision.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 84902

Title: Immunotherapy for advanced gastric cancer

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00505438

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Australia

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-12 07:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-12 07:09

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors replies to the reviewers comments and the revised manuscript are now satisfactory and i recommend publication