

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 51570

**Title:** Mesenterico-portal vein invasion should be an important factor in TNM staging for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: proposed modification of the 8th edition of the AJCC staging system

**Reviewer's code:** 03492099

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Research Fellow

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Author's country:** China

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-10-22 16:16

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-10-22 17:47

**Review time:** 1 Hour

| 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 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 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**

The authors performed Cox regression and they observed that MPV invasion is an independent prognostic factor in both databases. Subsequently, they split patients into two group: MPV(+) and MPV(-) and modified the stage of 8th AJCC. I have some comments: 1. Did the conditions of Cox regression be evaluated? If not, please evaluate the assumption of Cox by testing strategies (PMID 20233435) 2. Did MPV(+) patients with CA, SMA and/or CHA metastasis? 3. Did CA, SMA and/or CHA influent the survival of patients? 4. The Harrell concordance index is the method which can compared the performace of two stage. Thus, please perform this assay with SEER cohort and West China cohort

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [ Y ] No

### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [ Y ] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 51570

**Title:** Mesenterico-portal vein invasion should be an important factor in TNM staging for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: proposed modification of the 8th edition of the AJCC staging system

**Reviewer's code:** 03475242

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Author's country:** China

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-10-16 22:41

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-10-24 11:54

**Review time:** 7 Days and 13 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language | (High priority)                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input 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 interesting study was performed to assess the impact of MPV invasion on the prognosis of patients and to analyze whether the inclusion of MPV invasion can further improve the 8th edition of the AJCC, by using different data base: one is SEER large database and authors' own data. As a results, the 8th edition of the AJCC staging system of pancreatic cancer could not accurately predict the prognosis of patients with MPV invasion, recommending that primary tumors with MPV invasion be classified into T3 diseases. This is well written and well analyzed paper; however, the following this should be reconsidered. (1) In the abstract, what is two cohorts? No concrete database is mentioned Actually, SEER database and the West China Hospital database are used. (2) In SEER database, does MPV+ mean microscopic invasion of PV? (3) In West China Hospital database, did you include the patients who had invasion of SMA and CA? There is no description about this. (4) The rate of postindustrial lymph node metastatic seems to be significantly higher in SEER database compared to West China Hospital database: about 70 % vs. about 50%, as shown in Table. The authors should mention it. (5) In Table 3, what does the number in parecethes mean? (6) Did you assess the impact of other extrapancreatic tissue invasion on the prognosis of patients ? (7) You excluded the patients who had 5 or fewer lymph nodes examined. Why did you use "five" for the cutoff line? (8) I could not open the HP of CS even if using the URL you described in the reference 3. What is the specific contents of the "patients with tumors with CS extension data labeled "540""? Would you give me the reference as a PDF file ?

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

[ ] The same title



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☒ No

***BPG Search:***

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☒ No