

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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 84004

Title: SGK3 overexpression correlates with a poor prognosis in endoscopically resected

superficial esophageal squamous cell neoplasia: A long-term study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06129259

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-27 03:55

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-08 02:38

Review time: 8 Days and 22 Hours

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	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] 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	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article analyzed the relationship between the expression level of SGK3 in ESCN and clinicopathological features of ESCN by IHC. The authors claimed that SGK overexpression is a worse prognostic factors for ESCN after endoscopic resection. However, there are some question about the article. 1. Most of patients did not experience recurrence or metastasis. Please list the cause of death of both group (SGK3-overexpression and SGK3-normal). 2. Please explain in the discussion why the overexpression of SGK3 resulted in worse prognosis although the complete resection was performed. 3. Please exclaim the clinical impact about examining IHC for SGK3 in ESCN. For example, if we detected ESCN and perform a biopsy before treatment, the result of IHC for SGK3 in specimen would affect decision-making about treatment (endoscopic resection, surgical resection, chemotherapy, radiotherapy)? 4. More than half of ESCNs overexpressed SGK3. This finding mean that SGK3-normal ESCN has a better outcome, rather than the explanation that SGK3-overexpressed ESCN has a worse outcome. 5. Please unify the name of the control group (normal or negative).



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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 84004

Title: SGK3 overexpression correlates with a poor prognosis in endoscopically resected

superficial esophageal squamous cell neoplasia: A long-term study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06120635

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-28 07:07

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-09 04:06

Review time: 8 Days and 20 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	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	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
1	



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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] 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	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with a great interest the article titled "SGK3 overexpression correlates with poor prognosis in endoscopically resected superficial esophageal squamous cell neoplasia: a long-term study" by Xu N et al. I have some revisions to suggest. 1. The authors used the term 'esophageal squamous cell neoplasia (ESCN)', 'esophageal cancer' and 'squamous cell carcinoma' alternatively. However, ESCN includes low-grade intraepithelial neoplasia (LIN), high-grade intraepithelial neoplasia (HIN), squamous cell carcinoma in situ, squamous cell carcinoma. Nevertheless, the authors conducted this study using 92 ESCN consisted of HIN and squamous cell carcinoma. If the authors want to take the term ESCN, 'esophageal cancer' and 'squamous cell carcinoma' should be discarded as an alternative term. If the authors want to take the term esophageal cancer or squamous cell carcinoma, HIN should not be collected as a research materials. 2. Immunohistochemical expression pattern should be revised as SGK3 rather than ERBB3 (page 8, the last sentence). 3. Figure 1: 1) LIN is not categorized into esophageal cancer. 2) EP indicates HIN and squamous cell carcinoma in situ. 4. Figure 2: 1) All figures (A~D) are HIN? Give the classification of the neoplasia to the each photos. 2) There is no



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

cytoplasmic membranous staining of the SGK3 anywhere. C showed only nuclear staining and D showed nuclear staining with cytoplasmic overstaining only. 5. Table 1: Differentiated types High Middle Low should be revised as Well-differentiated Intermediate differentiated Poorly differentiated