

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 57212

Title: Establishment and validation of nomograms to predict the risk of ovarian metastasis in gastric cancer: based on a large cohort

Reviewer's code: 00183481

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-29

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-06-22 10:30

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-24 09:31

Review time: 1 Day and 23 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported a retrospective study of female patients with gastric cancer to analyze risk factors of ovarian metastasis. Eventually, some factors including high age, more than 6 lymph node metastasis, non-intestinal type, signet-ring cell carcinoma, etc. were found to be associated with ovarian metastasis. The nomogram model of the risk evaluation was constructed. Since this manuscript is well written and shows very clear conclusions, it should be accepted immediately.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 57212

Title: Establishment and validation of nomograms to predict the risk of ovarian metastasis in gastric cancer: based on a large cohort

Reviewer's code: 03766596

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-29

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-06-22 14:59

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-28 23:07

Review time: 6 Days and 8 Hours

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

Comments to Authors June 29, 2020 The authors have investigated the risk factors for ovarian metastasis and developed nomograms. The sample size is large enough, and many variables, both clinical and pathological, were investigated. This paper seems worth considering for publication. However, some revision will be needed. Please see the comments below.

1. The authors have excluded those who had distant metastasis other than ovary and peritoneum metastasis. Thus, the prevalence of ovarian metastasis in overall population may have been higher than that reported in their study. Please describe the numbers of included and excluded patients. If available, the prevalence of ovarian metastasis in excluded patients should be also described (if not available, not necessary). The exclusion criteria should be briefly explained in the abstract.
2. In the abstract, they mentioned “treatment options are controversial” and “the high-risk population should pay attention to the possibility of ovarian metastasis during reexamination, to detect and treat as early as possible”. In my opinion, when radically treated patients develop ovarian metastasis as the only site of recurrence, the diagnosis of ovarian metastasis is quite important. On the other hand, when ovarian metastasis is found in patients with advanced gastric cancer who are receiving palliative chemotherapy or best supportive care alone, the significance of ovarian metastasis is unclear. Please describe more clearly the importance of making diagnosis of ovarian metastasis and how it influences the treatment strategy for gastric cancer.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 57212

Title: Establishment and validation of nomograms to predict the risk of ovarian metastasis in gastric cancer: based on a large cohort

Reviewer's code: 05127911

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-29

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-06-24 08:01

Reviewer performed review: 2020-07-02 16:08

Review time: 8 Days and 8 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

check attached file, please