

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 85934

Title: Mitomycin C and capecitabine: An additional option as an advanced line therapy in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05050789

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Israel

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-23

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-23 16:40

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-01 22:53

Review time: 8 Days and 6 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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

Review of manuscript "Mitomycin C and Capecitabine: An Additional Option as an Advanced Line Therapy in Patients with Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. A Retrospective Analysis": - The first sentence of the abstract ("In recent years, survival with metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC) has improved significantly, due to better management and new treatment options. ") is not suitable for the context of the manuscript. If the goal of this manuscript has already been achieved, then what is the need to do this research? - In this study, MMC/capecitabine was used as the third or subsequent line of treatment. Has the previous administration of different drugs not affected the effectiveness of this treatment regimen? It seems to be appropriate to do a multivariate analysis to answer this question. - The authors did not mention surgery in the studied patients. Is the effectiveness of the studied drugs related to previous surgery? - This study examined data from patients over a large span of time (2006-2020). The quality of patient care may have been different at different times. Does this not affect the study of authors? Can the authors examine their study in two time periods? - The analysis methods are not well described in the manuscript.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 85934

Title: Mitomycin C and capecitabine: An additional option as an advanced line therapy in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05106105

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Technician, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Israel

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-23

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-23 12:50

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-29 13:13

Review time: 6 Days

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 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

We congratulate the authors for giving us an insight into the potential for MMC/capecitabine as third or further line of treatment in mCRC. In your retrospective study, mCRC patients received MMC/capecitabine after at least two previous lines of standard chemotherapy for metastatic disease., which has been prospective or retrospective evaluated in some literatures. There are also several shortcomings: 1) This study was a retrospective study and could not guarantee mCRC patient homogeneity prior to the enrollment in this study. 2) It is important to further help clinicians accurately judge the tumor characteristics after previous lines of standard chemotherapy prior to enrollment. Your reference documentation is not comprehensive enough. I also recommend that you give a final polish to your writing to keep your message as concise as possible.