PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63949

Title: AWG Y019 versus EWGSO criterion for diagnosing sarcopenia to predict long-term prognosis in Chinese patients with gastric cancer after radical gastrectomy

Reviewer's code: 03818597

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Instructor, Teaching Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-06 10:26

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-06 17:15

Review time: 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- Please provide core tip for this manuscript as journal style. - Keywords should be selected according to MeSH. - Methods and results in abstract should be revised to make it more readable. - Conclusion section was missed in the of manuscript. - The figure resolution was low, please upload high quality image. - Please specify in the table which the p values belong to which statistical test. - Please describe detail of AWGS2019 and EWGSOP2 criterion for diagnosis of sarcopenia in the separate table. - It is more interesting, if ROC curve was conducted for show the prediction ability of AWGS2019 and EWGSOP2 multivariable models.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Abbreviations that appear for the first time in the Abstract (AWGS2019, EWGSOP2) and Method (L3) need to be clearly defined. 2. Are there any recommended cut-off points for CT diagnosis of low skeletal muscle mass in AWGS2019 and EWGSOP2 ? Please list. 3. What is the specific method of grip strength measurement? 4. How long is the short-term weight loss in the data collection section. 5. In results section, "Compared with AWGS2019-sarcopenic patients, EWGSOP2-sarcopenia patents had a higher ratio of male ($p < 0.001$)", but P =0.018 for the gender variable in Table 1. At The same time, "The two groups were comparable in terms of age, BMI, Albumin, Asa grade, Charlson Comorbidity Index scores, and other characteristics", but there was no statistical difference in the relevant factors in Table 1. Please check the data carefully. 6. Comments for CCI in Table 1.7. Explanation of A and B in Fig. 2. 7. "The AWGS2019-Sarcopenia also led to a greater odds ratio in the multivariate model used here than The EWGSOP2-Sarcopenia (odds ratio 2.453 vs 1.550)" in the discussion section, which should be The HR value. 8. Nutritional support has a great influence on sarcopenia. Should preoperative patients with nutritional support be excluded?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63949

Title: AWG Y019 versus EWGSO   criterion for diagnosing sarcopenia to predict long-term prognosis in Chinese patients with gastric cancer after radical gastrectomy

Reviewer's code: 05223955

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-07 09:27

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-17 04:28

Review time: 9 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] 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) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comments The authors describe a prospective observational study showing that sarcopenia diagnosed by the latest AWGS2019 and EWGSOP2 criteria is a predictor of OS in Chinese gastric cancer patients. However, the date of approval from the ethics committee for this study was December 18, 2014, and the AWGS2019 criteria did not exist at that time, so there should be a discrepancy between the study design that was condoned at that time and the content of this retrospective cohort study. In addition, the authors suggest that the predictive model using AWGS2019-sarcopenia had better predictive power than the predictive model using EWGSOP2-sarcopenia, but the proportional hazards model cannot be interpreted as superior or inferior predictive power. Such research ethical and statistical misunderstandings play havoc with the paper's readers and require accurate description.   Specific comments: 1) Figure 1 does not accurately show the difference between the AWGS2019 and EWGSOP2 criteria. The details of the algorithm for the diagnosis described in the existing report should be accurately drawn up with the reference paper notated in the figure legends.   2) As mentioned in the general commment, the exact content of this study that was condoned must be stated in the methods section. In the proportional hazards model, the reason why some of the parameters that were found to be significantly different in the univariate analysis were excluded in the multivariate analysis should be stated in the results section. Interpretation of predictors should also be discussed again. If the authors can't do that, then the conclusion needs to be changed.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63949

Title: AWG Y019 versus EWGSO criterion for diagnosing sarcopenia to predict long-term prognosis in Chinese patients with gastric cancer after radical gastrectomy

Reviewer's code: 03818597

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Instructor, Teaching Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-06

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-24 03:38

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-24 05:00

Review time: 1 Hour

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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well revised.

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) [Y] Accept (General priority)
	[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I find that the authors have complied well to the Reviewer requests. In totalt, this is an interesting paper with important implications.