

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71638

Title: Concurrent chemoradiotherapy using gemcitabine and nedaplatin in recurrent or locally advanced head and neck squamous cell carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05330707

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-11 01:57

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-16 06:50

Review time: 5 Days and 4 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

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

The authors investigated the safety and efficacy of gemcitabine plus nedaplatin with concurrent chemoradiotherapy for head neck squamous cell carcinoma. The study is well conducted and the methods used are appropriate.
 I have following concerns.
 (1) I think it is appropriate to submit this article to the journal on head and neck cancer or oncology because this study included only two cases of cervical esophageal cancer and most of the description is related to head and neck cancer.
 (2) Please describe the radiation therapy regimen for 4 patients who have received radiation therapy in the past. Did you change the radiation dose or fields?
 (3) A total of 4 patients who received this chemoradiotherapy died from oral and nasal hemorrhage. Please cite previous reports on the frequency of deaths from hemorrhage in other chemoradiotherapy regimens and compare them to the frequency of deaths in this regimen.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71638

Title: Concurrent chemoradiotherapy using gemcitabine and nedaplatin in recurrent or locally advanced head and neck squamous cell carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02887546

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MAMS, MBBS, PhD

Professional title: Dean, Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-20 16:30

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-25 08:27

Review time: 4 Days and 15 Hours

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 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: [<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

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 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? Yes 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?
Yes 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes 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? Yes 13 Research



**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>

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? Yes 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? Yes