

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 72696

Title: Increased prognostic value of clinical–reproductive model in Chinese female patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05915662

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-25 11:58

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-09 06:02

Review time: 14 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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	[]Yes [Y]No



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is generally OK but I have some suggestions. 1. How to remove the influence of different treatment schemes before or after operation. 2. "Factors affecting OS in univariate analysis (P < 0.20) were included". Why select the range of P < 0.20. The corresponding reference is not proved. 3. 286 patients were randomly assigned to a primary training cohort and an internal validation cohort. It is not described the randomized manner.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 72696

Title: Increased prognostic value of clinical–reproductive model in Chinese female patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05388315

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-06 06:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-18 21:19

Review time: 12 Days and 15 Hours

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
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In some cancers, TNM staging remains sufficient for both prognosis and treatment selection. Esophageal cancer is also in this group. This study has been a valuable study that will contribute to the literature.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 72696

Title: Increased prognostic value of clinical–reproductive model in Chinese female patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05560822

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-12 21:25

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-24 14:23

Review time: 11 Days and 16 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good idea, well constructed work, readable well written manuscript with clear conclusion