PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [Y] Minor revision [ ] 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

The present study reported that regorafenib combined PD-1 inhibitor is effective in some patients with microsatellite stable metastatic colon cancer, and platelet-to lymphocyte ratio might be useful predictive biomarker. The topic is interesting, and manuscript is well written. However, there are some concerns to be clarified. 1. In this study, four domestic anti-PD-1 inhibitors as well as nivolumab and pembrolizumab have been used. The authors should include discussion regarding the effect on treatment outcome according to different anti-PD-1 inhibitors. 2. Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio did not predict the treatment efficacy. It would be better to discuss the reason for this result.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 72117

Title: Regorafenib combined with programmed cell death-1 inhibitor against refractory colorectal cancer and the platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio's prediction on effectiveness

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03739641

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Nurse, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-19 04:28

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-01 05:37

Review time: 13 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your effort to conduct this study and giving me a chance of review your manuscript. I have some questions and comments below. 1. You mentioned ECOG score in the manuscript. Usually it writes ECOG PS (performance status). Please check and revise those parts in whole manuscript.   2. In the results part 3.1, you used 60< and 60<. 60 years old case are not included this part. Please check and revise it like $\geqq$.   3. At figure 1 and figure 3, you wrote K-M figures. Usually, the researcher should write the number of patients under the K-M figures. Please check and revise those figures even if your sample size is small.   4. At table 4, you wrote the number of patient and those percentages in the (). Please add its explanation first line of the table 4.   5. At figure 4, the authors did not mention the units of values. Please add the units all the figures here in figure 4.