Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

• Was the study only retrospective? • The title of the manuscript needs a modification, it should include study design and sample along with keywords may be modified as 'Association of resectable pancreatic cancer with low preoperative skeletal muscle index among young and elderly patients' • The methodology needs to be revisit, as per description of the study it seems to be an ambidirectional study that includes a retrospective chart review along with prospective follow up… this needs to be written clearly. • As per title and study design the parts of methodology, results and discussion portion needs a thorough revision.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 80082

Title: Low preoperative skeletal muscle index increases the risk of mortality among resectable pancreatic cancer patients: A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05429162

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Chief Doctor, Doctor, Research Fellow, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-10 10:02

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-17 10:48

Review time: 7 Days

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

Summary Cai et al. evaluated significance of preoperative skeletal muscle index among elderly patients with resectable pancreatic cancer. Overall, the manuscript is well described the usefulness of the stent, however, there are some major points to be revised.

Major points [Introduction] 1) In the introduction, the following reference article should be cited.   Sato et al. Pancreatology. 2021 Aug;21(5):892-902.   Emori et al. Pancreatology. 2022 Mar;22(2):277-285.   Uemura et al. Br J Nutr. 2021 May 28;125(10):1140-1147.   Asama et al. Pancreas. 2022 Feb 1;51(2):148-152.   [Materials and methods] Clinical data collection 2)   The term patients recruited should be written in the main text. [Materials and methods] CT-based body composition assessment 3) Usually the skeletal muscle quantification in the cross-sectional CT image is used at the level of the third lumbar vertebral body (L3). Please cite the reference below. Sato et al. Pancreatology. 2021 Aug;21(5):892-902. [Materials and methods] Cutoff value and classification settings 4)   The authors stated that the cutoff values were selected based on the best accuracy of 1-year mortality. However, the rationale of the 1-year mortality and overall survival and recurrence-free survival is not clear. The cutoff value should be set based on the previous reports.   [Results] Patient characteristics according to SMI and SMD 5)   In the table 1, some factors were significantly difference between low/high SMI and low/high SMD groups. If the authors would like to show SMI is truly significant factor to contribute to overall survival, these factors should be corrected by using propensity score matching (Okugawa et al. JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr. 2018 Nov;42(8):1322-1333.)

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is a significant contribution, and I think the current revision can be accepted for publication.