



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38178

Title: Pressurized IntraPeritoneal Aerosol Chemotheprapy (PIPAC) after misdiagnosed gastric cancer - a case report

Reviewer's code: 00503561

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-02-06

Date reviewed: 2018-02-06

Review time: 0 Hour

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I agree with the authors in that this anecdotal experience should be evaluated in more robust manner. Please address possible ethical consideration in the procedure in this manuscript and the process the author experienced or felt during their well-inteded trial.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38178

Title: Pressurized IntraPeritoneal Aerosol Chemotheprapy (PIPAC) after misdiagnosed gastric cancer - a case report

Reviewer's code: 00227403

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-02-06

Date reviewed: 2018-02-07

Review time: 1 Day

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors report the first case of Pressurized IntraPeritoneal Aerosol Chemotheprapy application as neoadjuvant therapy before palliative D2-Gastrectomy combined with liver metastasectomy in a patient with primarily diagnosed and operated Krukenberg tumor. English language should be revised: see for example "Chemotheprapy" in the initial part of the abstract. The authors should describe the results of the abdominal CT-scan as reported by the radiologist, before to conclude metastasis. Could the authors explain why they waited eight weeks after staging laparoscopy before to perform a laparotomy? Is this a protocol? It is unclear how the authors judged the cytoreduction (from ?? to 3 cm)

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38178

Title: Pressurized IntraPeritoneal Aerosol Chemotheprapy (PIPAC) after misdiagnosed gastric cancer - a case report

Reviewer's code: 00058340

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-02-06

Date reviewed: 2018-02-10

Review time: 4 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[] The same title	[] High priority for publication
[] Grade C: Good	[] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[] Duplicate publication	[] Rejection
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade D: Rejected	[Y] No	[] Minor revision
[] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments 1) The paper is well conceived and provides a new important information. The authors should elaborate more on the technique used and perhaps provide the diagrammatic presentation n of the Pressurized IntraPeritoneal Aerosol Chemotheprapy system. 2) The paper requires a carefull linguistic and stylistic revisions, e.g.: a) "This case might contribute to confirm in the future the usefulness of PIPAC procedure as rescue or neoadjuvant, supportive form of therapy in very selected group of patients with KT presentation of gastric cancer - qualified latterly to classic chemotherapy or standard oncologic surgery procedures." This sentence is too long and convoluted; I it should be shortened and simplified b) "poorly cohesive adenocarcinoma" - possibly authors meant poorly differentiated .. c) "After 30 minutes application time, the toxic aerosol is released safely via a Closed....." was



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

aspirated or removed d) "vastness of CRS surgery" ... needs to be rephrased e)
"Anatomopathology showed a poorly cohesive carcinoma" replace with
histopathologic evaluation demonstrated f) "guidelines alike the role of gastrectomy is
still not fully answered" replace with guidelines regarding g) "Histological antral
mucosa assay: (c) poorl g) "Histological antral mucosa assay: (c) poorly cohesive"
replace with histopathologic evaluation h)"suspiced nodules" replace with suspicious
nodules i)"Figure 4 The results of pathology assay performed after open
D2-Gastrectomy" replace with histopathologic evaluation