

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 62034

Title: Prognostic role of sarcopenia in metastatic colorectal cancer patients during first line chemotherapy: A retrospective study

Reviewer's code: 05116713

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-26

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-28 09:26

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-28 09:32

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

Although the result of the study was negative, that's fine, as that answers the question asked, within the scope of the limited sample size (a factor that the authors state). Statistical analyses and interpretations seem adequate and the paper is also adequately written. As such, it is acceptable, and represents a contribution to the field.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 62034

Title: Prognostic role of sarcopenia in metastatic colorectal cancer patients during first line chemotherapy: A retrospective study

Reviewer's code: 01588319

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-26

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-28 03:24

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-19 00:14

Review time: 21 Days and 20 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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 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

1. The definition of sarcopenia is only based on SMI in this study. It is different from the current guideline for defining sarcopenia (for European or Asian population), please clarify it. 2. There were 14 patients with sarcopenia at the baseline, the authors also reported that 7 patients became sarcopenic. Why this study did not analyze these 7 patients with sarcopenia? 3. Although this study focused on mCRC, the authors reported that 23 patients had II or III stage disease according to the pTNM classification and they subsequently developed metastases; 33 patients received the diagnosis at metastatic stage. This implied that 56 so-called “mCRC” patients with different time points of metastasis which will lead to different clinical outcomes, please clarify it. 4. The contents of the “Discussion” section should be concise. For example, the relevant descriptions of the study conducted by Prado et al. are too much. Please avoid describing the detail contents and just focus on discussing the key points 5. In Table 1, the p values for the “Toxicity during the first 4 chemotherapy cycles” should not be “1”, please provide the true p values.