

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78091

Title: Clinical outcomes of targeted therapies in elderly patients aged ≥ 80 years with

metastatic colorectal cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04966996 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-08 14:12

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-08 15:00

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Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
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
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript presented by the authors is very interesting and well writen. The topic is of absolute interest as the group of very elderly patients, with of age higher than 80 years, is increasing progresively. As the authors comment this paper is only a short comunication based only on 30 patients. The importance of the paper is that it shows that the combination chemotherapy with TA for metastatic CRC may be considered in highly selected elderly patients with considerable caution and with acceptable authors should include at the beginning of Methods section that it is a retrospective study. In the original version, no mention to this point is shown.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78091

Title: Clinical outcomes of targeted therapies in elderly patients aged ≥ 80 years with

metastatic colorectal cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05194092 Position: Associate Editor Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-21 13:28

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-26 13:27

Review time: 4 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
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 [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer statements

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To determine the efficacy and safety of combination chemotherapy for metastatic CRC in patients aged above 80 years, 30 metastatic colorectal cancer patients were used to evaluated the effects of combination chemotherapy with TA for patients. Study showed that for the patients who aged above 80 years, combination chemotherapy with TA for metastatic CRC may be considered feasible and salvage chemotherapy can help improve overall survival rates in some selected of these elderly patients. Although this study has certain clinical guiding significance, there are still some problems as follows, 1. Overall, the manuscript was not well rationale, especially in the results and discussion section. Please carefully reorganize and rewrite it. 2. For ethics statements, "Informed consent for chemotherapy was obtained from all patients." Such description is not appropriate, because the patients not only need to be informed about their participation in chemotherapy, they should also be informed about their participation in this study. Please provide some details about your "Informed consent". 3. For experimental design, "Of 30 patients, the median age of 15 patients treated with TA was 83.0 years and that of those without TA was 81.3 years." For what principle (or criterion) are these patients divided into two groups? Age, or disease progression, please give a reasonable reason. 4. For figures and tables in this study, almost all the data was presented as tables, I guess it can be presented as figures which will be more intuitively to deliver the points. (personal suggestion) 5. The impact of different treatment methods on patients requires multi-dimensional evaluation, and should not be limited to indicators such as mortality. For example, the evaluation of patients' feelings should also be displayed, e.g. quality of life.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78091

Title: Clinical outcomes of targeted therapies in elderly patients aged ≥ 80 years with

metastatic colorectal cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04966996 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-07

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-30 11:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-31 08:26

Review time: 20 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] 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	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has been modified according with the recomendations. It imay be now acceptable for publication