PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73829

Title: Prognostic value of computed tomography derived skeletal muscle mass index in lung cancer: a meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05724323

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-05 15:48

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-15 15:26

Review time: 9 Days and 23 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ ] 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 research is interesting and will provide evidence for future research and clinical practice. However, there are several issues to be further addressed before publication.

1. This meta-analysis was performed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA 2020) checklist. However, PRISMA 2009 checkist was attached in the Appendix.   2. In the section of "Literature retrieval", authors mentioned that "the PubMed, Web of Science and EMBASE electronic databases were searched up to November 5, 2021." However, what was the inception date for the search?   3. Were keywords and MeSH terms both used in literature retrieval?   4. In "Figure 1. The flow diagram of this meta-analysis", authors don't need to show reasons for "n=0" for the excluded studies.   5. Figure 2 is not the funnel plot. Instead, it is a forest plot.   6. Please list potential reasons for the heterogeneity in meta-analysis as shown in Figure 2.   7. I cannot find the registration information on page 4 according to the attached PRISMA checklist.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73829

Title: Prognostic value of computed tomography derived skeletal muscle mass index in lung cancer: a meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05151858

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-28 12:04

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-28 12:15

Review time: 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	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] 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

It is a good comment, but I could not understand the subject very well.