

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 48521

Title: Abdominal Metastases of Soft Tissue Sarcoma – A Systematic Review.

Reviewer's code: 01047751

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MA, MSc

Professional title: Statistician

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Author's country: Austria

Reviewer chosen by: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-20 09:48

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-21 17:02

Review time: 1 Day and 7 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

“Abdominal Metastases of Soft Tissue Sarcoma – A Systematic Review” Comments on

the article submitted to the World Journal of Gastroenterology by M.A. Smolle et al

Author : P.N. Lee

Date : 21st March 2019 I am commenting on this as an epidemiologist/statistician familiar with meta-analysis, not qualified in medicine but also quite used to dealing with data on pathology. One main interest of the paper is to estimate the incidence of abdominal metastases (AM) and retroperitoneal metastases (RM) in patients with primary extremity soft tissue sarcoma (eSTS). In assessing this I found the single table (perversely labelled TABLES rather than Table 1) to be rather confusing. For a start I would separate out the eight case reports and also the study by Rehders into a different table, as every person considered had metastases, and this tells us nothing about the incidence of metastases. The other eight publications could be considered in a separate table, which would lose the column "Type" as all are original articles and have separate columns giving the number of eSTS, the number of metastases, and the percentage of metastases out of the number of eSTS. Looking at these eight publications I have comments on a few. Grimme – mentions 38 STS; should this be 38 eSTS? King, Gorelik – why are we mentioning extra-pulmonary metastases? Is not the interest in AM/RM only? Gorelik – why are we mentioning myxoid liposarcoma twice? Lev-Chelouche – how many patients with eSTS? Ogose – says 24 with eSTS out of 282 with AM. Is this a mistake? One is concerned with number with AM out of number with eSTS. From the data provided we can compute the following rates: Grimme $5/38 = 13.2\%$ Liver Thompson $7/140 = 5\%$ AM King $7/124 = 5.6\%$ AM Gordelik $4/33 = 12.1\%$ AM Behranwala $19/2127 = 0.9\%$ AM Lev-Chelouche $10/? = ?\%$ RM Ogose $24/282 = 8.5\%$ AM Sheah $11/112 = 9.8\%$ 9 AM + 2 RM Why is the rate not always given in the Table? Why does the abstract refer to the incidence of AM ranging from 0.9% to 5.6%? It seems to be higher in Gordelik and Sheah and also in Ogose if I have the data correct. This comment also relates to the bizarre statement in Results/Incidence where it starts



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

by stating the incidence ranges up to 5.6% and then says it may be higher! Why does the title of the paper refer to “Soft Tissue Sarcoma” and not to “Primary Extremity Soft Tissue Sarcoma” which is the actual subject of the paper? I note that RM are not mentioned in many of the studies. Does this mean there were none? This should be made clear. Can conclusions for AM be applied to AM and RM? While the English is generally fine, I noticed that in the “core tips” the phrase “reported to as high as” should read “reported to be as high as”, and that in the discussion/incidence line 2 it should be “varied” and not “was varied”.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 48521

Title: Abdominal Metastases of Soft Tissue Sarcoma – A Systematic Review.

Reviewer's code: 00066723

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Author's country: Austria

Reviewer chosen by: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-20 10:12

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-28 12:04

Review time: 8 Days and 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is a short literature review with a clear take-home message. The

manuscript deals with a rare tumor type (STS of the extremities) in combination with the rare event of abdominal and retroperitoneal metastases, explaining the rather limited number of references that is reviewed. I have a few remarks. Minor comments: 1. I fail to see why the authors did not include publications before the year 2000. In fact the authors themselves identify this as a limitation of their study. The authors should at least indicate clearly why this has not been done. 2. Page 3, line 12 - "The occurrence of these rare metastases...." Omit rare as it occurs twice in this sentence. 3. It is unclear whether the patients received adjuvant radio- or chemotherapy. Please specify more explicitly. 4. Page 8, 9 - Explain abbreviation CTX. Also add it to the list of abbreviations. 5. Page 9 - Clearly summarize the main conclusions under a separate header "Conclusions".

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No