

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 60753

**Title:** Critical prognostic value of the log odds of negative lymph nodes/tumor size in rectal cancer patients

**Reviewer's code:** 00070916

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Senior Researcher, Senior Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Chen-Chen Gao

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-12-10 09:29

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-12-18 12:32

**Review time:** 8 Days and 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" 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**

In this manuscript, the authors suggest a potentially novel prognostic score to stratify risks for rectal cancer patients: log odds of NLN divided by tumor size basing on a SEER analysis. The general idea is very interesting since - as the authors outline in their discussion - this score could be calculated using standard data available anyway in every pathological chart. However, there are aspects to be improved before the manuscript could eventually be accepted for publication: 1. In my opinion, it is totally unclear why this analysis is restricted to rectal cancer - the remaining colon would deliver an ideal either additional or control group. 2. Why is the distribution of the training cohort versus validation cohort so uneven? 3. Please cite a suited work to proof that the relative degree of LND can be quantified by comparing pure numbers of dissected LNs with the tumor size. 4. In general, the manuscript must be carefully checked concerning typos and style. Similarly, the Figures should be checked - for example Figure 2: the left lower graph is too high.