

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 70292

Title: Association and prognostic significance of alpha-L-fucosidase-1 and matrix metalloproteinase 9 expression in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03709972

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-12 10:24

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-14 14:24

Review time: 2 Days and 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" 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: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Checklist

- 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes,
- 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? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes, the research objectives was achieved by the experiments.
- 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? @ see below specific comments
- 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Figures and tables were sufficient and good.
- 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? The authors had provided the certificate regarding statistical review. .
- 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes
- 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? Yes 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? >> 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? @ see below specific comment 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? >> Ethic approval was provided in the files for review. # Specific comments The original findings of this manuscript was that the authors found high FUCA1 expression was significantly correlated with MMP-9 expression and was associated with worse OS in patients with resected esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. The quality and importance of this manuscript was acceptable except □ The reviewer can't find the STROBE Statement in the files for review. □ " CONCLUSION In conclusion, we speculate that the molecular mechanisms of FUCA1 in ESCC are entirely different in adenocarcinoma. The increased FUCA1 protein plays a key role in ESCC invasion and migration, but this effect may be reversed by a specific FUCA1 inhibitor (deoxyfuconojirimycin) or FUCA1 siRNA." >> The reviewer wondered if these was the appropriate conclusion. Nether "Adenocarcinoma" nor "deoxyfuconojirimycin" were investigated in the methods. The

statement in the abstract (“FUCA1 cooperation with MMP-9 may have a major role in affecting the ESCC invasion and metastatic capability and serve as a valuable prognostic biomarker in patients who underwent esophagectomy for ESCC.”) may be a better statement. The limitations of the study included [but not limited to] the omission of potential confounders [such as the serum level of Alpha-l-fucosidase]. □ Suggest to comment that serum level of (Alpha-L-fucosidase-1) had been reported to be a prognostic factor [ref-5 = Journal of thoracic disease 2019; 11(9): 3980-3990] but was not considered in the Cox regression analyses used in the current manuscript

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 70292

Title: Association and prognostic significance of alpha-L-fucosidase-1 and matrix metalloproteinase 9 expression in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06079737

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-12 11:02

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-15 12:34

Review time: 3 Days and 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 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 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



**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

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Following are the comments: • Very nice and well written manuscript with pioneering observations. It is worth publishing. However, there are few observations: 1. In abstract section – Core tip: the line “in adenocarcinomas, such as breast cancer, colorectal cancer and intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma” is beyond the scope of study and it should be deleted. 2. In conclusion – Word ‘metastasis’ appears more appropriate than ‘migration’. Further the part of sentence after migration appears inappropriate, needs correction. 3. There is lot of repeats in article highlight which could be more precise. 4. In References: the name of journal is not abbreviated, hence checked according to the pattern of journal. 5. Minor grammatic or otherwise changes are mentioned within the manuscript.