

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 72749

**Title:** Pretreatment serum albumin-to-alkaline phosphatase ratio is an independent prognosticator of survival in patients with metastatic gastric cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03769068

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-16 13:34

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-11-24 17:53

**Review time:** 8 Days and 4 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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>

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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The aim of this retrospective study was to investigate the prognostic value of AAPR in distant metastatic GC. This is a well-designed study and the manuscript is well written. When the authors evaluate sub-groups, the number of patients in certain analyzes falls. However, the authors assume this limitation at the end of the discussion.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 72749

**Title:** Pretreatment serum albumin-to-alkaline phosphatase ratio is an independent prognosticator of survival in patients with metastatic gastric cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05465522

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** FRCS (Gen Surg), MD

**Professional title:** Associate Specialist, Medical Assistant, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist, Teacher

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-18 07:54

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-11-26 19:03

**Review time:** 8 Days and 11 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection

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

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors presented a retrospective study relationship between serum albumin / alkaline phosphatase ratio as is an independent prognosticator of survival in metastatic gastric cancer. When we discussed about another kind of metastatic cancer, for example: Metastasis hepatic colon rectal, in this case we have validated the Fong's criteria in the literature. So, it's possible resection of the both tumors and better overall survival / survival disease free. I'd like that authors to explain what's the applicability is in practice? Because in that case the gastric cancer are advanced, with metastasis. If we are knowledge about relationship between serum albumin / alkaline phosphatase ratio as is an independent prognosticator of survival in metastatic gastric cancer, what's the conduct change? I think that if change the conduct, is important. On the other hand if not change, it is just curious. The criteria were validated?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 72749

**Title:** Pretreatment serum albumin-to-alkaline phosphatase ratio is an independent prognosticator of survival in patients with metastatic gastric cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03822338

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACS, MBBS, MNAMS, MS

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-21 18:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-03 18:49

**Review time:** 11 Days and 23 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 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

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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? YES

What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? It tries to figure out the effect of the Albumin alkaline phosphatase ratio on the DFS and OS in metastatic gastric cancers 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? YES Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? No 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? YES Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? NO 12

Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgooffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgooffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? YES Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? OK 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? NO 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