

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 58256

**Title:** Clinical benefit of COX-2 inhibitors in the adjuvant chemotherapy of advanced non-small cell lung cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 03397971

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-07 09:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-24 13:34

**Review time:** 17 Days and 4 Hours

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 ] Grade E: Do not publish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

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES. I would add "meta-analysis" in the title. 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? YES 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? YES 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? YES 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? YES What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? The authors performed a systematic review base on 12 RCTs on the clinical benefit of COX2 inhibitors combined with adjuvant chemotherapy in the treatment of advanced NSCLC patients. This metaanalysis demonstrated that in terms of ORR for patients received adjuvant chemotherapy of advanced NSCLC, COX-2 inhibitors improved the ORR and have no improvement on prolonged mortality. However, particularly with first-line chemotherapy, the COX-2 could enhance both the ORR and improved the 1-year SR. Concerning toxicity, celecoxib plus chemotherapy resulted in a higher incidence of hematologic toxicities. Meanwhile, the rofecoxib may augment the risk of cardiovascular events. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? YES. In my opinion all these aspects are fulfilled. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? All the figures are clear. 9  
Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? 10 Units.  
Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? 11 References. Does the  
manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the  
introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite  
and/or over-cite references? 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation.  
Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style,  
language and grammar accurate and appropriate? 13 Research methods and reporting.  
Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the  
appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2)  
CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized  
Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based  
Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control  
study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines  
- Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate  
research methods and reporting? 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving  
human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal  
ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review  
committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?