

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 80075

Title: Oncologic impact of colonic stents for obstructive left-sided colon cancer

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04652032

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-03 06:45

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-11 11:15

Review time: 8 Days and 4 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods?

	<input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No
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

I think this is a very good review. However, there are a few problems. Minor comments: TECHNICAL AND CLINICAL SUCCESS RATES section: #1 Reference No. 17 is an older paper. It should cite more recent one. #2 For ColoRectal Obstruction Scoring System (CROSS), "Japan Colonic Stent Safe Procedure Research (JCSSPR) Group. CROSS: ColoRectal Obstruction Scoring System 2012. Available from: https://colon-stent.com/001_mainpage_en.html" should be cited, not reference No. 21. COMPLICATIONS section: #3 Perforation 2nd paragraph Please mention that it should be noted that emergency surgery had better postoperative outcomes than BTS by stent because of the lower success rate of stent placement reported prior to 2014. #4 Perforation last paragraph Regarding results of WallFlex stent, it should also be mentioned that in a prospective multicenter study using WallFlex stent in Japan, the perforation rate was 1.6%. (A prospective multicenter study on self-expandable metallic stents as a bridge to surgery for malignant colorectal obstruction in Japan: efficacy and



**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>

safety in 312 patients. Surg Endosc (2016) 30:3976–3986.) #5 Migration and re-obstruction
I am aware that laser or balloon dilation prior to stent placement is not recommended,
but can you mention it? #6 Safety of chemotherapy section: last paragraph the
perforation rate in the bevacizumab group was only 1%, which was lower than that of
the non-bevacizumab group (3%). Since there is no significant difference, I think author
should describe that they were equivalent.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 80075

Title: Oncologic impact of colonic stents for obstructive left-sided colon cancer

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03397272

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Slovenia

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-19

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-10 13:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-20 17:45

Review time: 10 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods?

	<input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very good. No special changes needed.