

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 83248

**Title:** Microvessel Density in patients with Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumors: a systematic review and meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02904481

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MSc

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Chief Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-17 06:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-26 23:04

**Review time:** 9 Days and 16 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

This is an interesting manuscript reviewing microvessel density (MVD) in patients with gastrointestinal stromal Tumors (GIST). A detail analysis as well as tables and figures has been given in the manuscript. Subgroup analysis according to tumor location, tumor size, or mitotic count is suggested if possible.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 83248

**Title:** Microvessel Density in patients with Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumors: a systematic review and meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05842368

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-20 13:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-28 05:43

**Review time:** 7 Days and 15 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
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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

This manuscript, which systematically explored the impact of microvessel density on the DFS of patients with GIST, is well written with fluent language. The topic per se is of great clinical meaning, but is discounted by the limited and low-level clinical evidence. Especially the cutoff value to differentiate low MVD from high MVD was not consistent in researches included. If authors could give a uniform and clear cutoff value based on current data, the conclusion of the systematic review will be easier to extrapolate. Meanwhile, the title is too general, could be revised to better reflect the aims of the study. Besides, key words were not appropriate, authors could use short phrases instead of the meaningless single word, and a small mistake in sentence "If the discrepancies were not encountered, the opinion of a third investigator (K.D) was considered", "not encounter" should be "encountered".