Baishideng Publishing Group

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: 55191

Title: Quality of life in patients with gastroenteropancreatic tumours: A systematic literature review

Reviewer's code: 03732555

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-10 14:11

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-10 15:13

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This ia a good review. Authors try to review the treatment on HRQoL of GEP-NETs. However, the HRQoL assessment part was so long and tedious, and I propose the author to simplify it. The author should explain the difference among the assessments, and why prefer EORTC QLQ-C30 and GINET21 GEP-NETs. and we also want to know the conlclusion or tendency of the author on the HRQoL of GEP-NETs following treatment.

Baishideng Publishing Group

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: 55191

Title: Quality of life in patients with gastroenteropancreatic tumours: A systematic literature review

Reviewer's code: 00506472

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-17 10:44

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-17 15:04

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
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	[ ] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a well written paper regarding a systematic literature review of health-related quality of life (HRQL) in Gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine tumours. Please discuss how different treatment regimens may impact HRQL parameters.

Baishideng Publishing Group

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: 55191

Title: Quality of life in patients with gastroenteropancreatic tumours: A systematic literature review

Reviewer's code: 00053420

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Postdoctoral Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-20 20:57

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-21 22:50

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
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) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comment: This manuscript focuses on an interesting topic and the authors present their report in a well-written manner. However, there are certain major issues to be addressed prior to be considered for publication. Title: The authors performed a systematic review on studies assessing quality of life in GEP-NET patients including both cross-sectional and intervention studies. I strongly suggest to focus exclusively on pharmacological intervention studies excluding cross-sectional data and the study of the psychotherapeutic intervention based on SCT. After all, the authors emphasized the importance of taking into consideration quality of life when evaluating treatment outcomes. In this respect, the manuscript's title should be modified accordingly (for example: The impact of pharmacological treatments on GEP-NET patients' quality of life: a systematic review) Methods: The authors should present in more detail their search strategy and provide a relevant flow diagram Results: Although the authors refer to quality assessment at the methods section , there is no relevant data at the results section. In addition, given that most included studies used the EORTC QLQ-C30 or the GINET21, the authors should perform a meta-analysis or explain the reason not to. Results should not be presented study by study but should be classified and integrated in order to provide more solid and useful information. Discussion: The authors summarize their findings and make to the point suggestions regarding future research and clinical practice. However, they should avoid to re-iterate results and present p-values in the discussion section Results: