

# 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority)</li> <li>[ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ Y] Minor revision</li> <li>[ ] Major revision</li> <li>[ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
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	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
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