

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 64294

Title: Diffuse reduction of spleen density is a novel prognostic marker for intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma after curative resection

Reviewer's code: 03741771

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Postdoctoral Fellow, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-09 08:17

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-19 10:05

Review time: 10 Days and 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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. Page 6 line 88: . The two cliniccohorts includedwere:. Some data is missing please add more details about the cohorts that have been included 2. Page 10 line 158-159 How did you calculate the best cut-off value? 3. Figure 4, 5 and 6 Please replace the figures. It is not clear enough and it is hard to read it. 4. How did you measure portal hypertension? Was this based on HVPG? 5. According to table 1 – 24 patients had Child-Pugh B but only 4 patients had Portal Hypertension. How is it possible to have a decompensated liver cirrhosis (here Child B) and no portal hypetension? In the same table it is mentioned that 32 patients had liver cirrhosisbut 143 had Child Pugh A cirrhosis. How is it possible to have only 4 patients with portal hyperthenison out of 143. Please explain how many had portal hypertension. All the results must be rechecked keeping in mind the above mentioned details. I would expect to see different spleen density in patients with cirrhosis compared to those without. At least these are my taughts. How could it be possible to have similar spleen density in patients with portal hypertension compared to those without? Please explain.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 64294

Title: Diffuse reduction of spleen density is a novel prognostic marker for intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma after curative resection

Reviewer's code: 03741771

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Postdoctoral Fellow, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-20

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-21 04:36

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-21 15:19

Review time: 10 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
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



**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>

In table 1 that you have attached to the document "Point to point response" Child-Pugh B - 8 patients and 16 patients. In total 24 patients. Once again - Child-Pugh B means -clinically significant portal hypertension for certain HVPG (even though it was not measured) is higher than 10 mmHg. You had 24 patients with portal hypertension. Now I think the data volume might be large enough. Meaning you have to do the maths once again. But this time consider that 24 patients have portal hypertension and not 4!!!!!! How is it possible to do not have cirrhosis but to have a Child-Pugh class? Child-Pugh class is used only for patients with cirrhosis.