

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 82663

**Title:** External validation of the Moroccan Arabic version of the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer colorectal (C Y9) module: Monocentric study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03251421

**Position:** Editor-in-Chief

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-30 05:36

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-03 08:44

**Review time:** 4 Days and 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

It's a single-center observational study to validate the Moroccan Arabic version of EORTC QLQ CR29. Conventional indicators such as Cronbach's alpha coefficient, ICCs and validity were used to evaluate the questionnaire and many similar studies have been reported. In addition, there are several issues in this paper: Section-Abstract 1. In "Methods" section, spelling error "QLQ C330" should be corrected. Section-Methods 1. In "Description of the instruments" section, whether subtitle "The EORTC QLQ-C30" needs to be added, like "The EORTC QLQ-CR29"? 2. The paper mentioned that the adaptation of the Moroccan Arabic version of EORTC QLQ CR29 was performed on a very limited sample size of 120 patients, but the study still has a relatively small sample size of 221 patients. 3. How was the sample size for examining the test-retest reliability (34 patients) determined? Section-Results 1. More basic characteristics, such as socio-economic status, educational status, marital status, tumor histology grade and operative method etc, are suggested to be shown in the paper. 2. The result of ICCs needs to be unified. It is 0.889-0.999 in the table and 0.889-1 in the text description. 3. The result of acceptability, that is, the questionnaire completion and miss rate, is suggested to



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

be added in the paper. Section- Discussion 1. In the sentence of “In the assessment of construct validity, correlations...”, whether “construct validity” needs to be changed as “concurrent validity”.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 82663

**Title:** External validation of the Moroccan Arabic version of the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer colorectal (C 9) module: Monocentric study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03262130

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-06 20:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-09 10:51

**Review time:** 2 Days and 13 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors did hard work to validate the Moroccan Arabic version of the EORTC Colorectal (CR29) module. A minor issue, the radiation therapy(RT) is indicayed only for rectal cancer, so, percentage of RT better expressed only in rectal cancer patients. Hhow about adjuvant(not neoadjuvant) RT? was there any rectal cancer patients who have received adjuvant RT?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 82663

**Title:** External validation of the Moroccan Arabic version of the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer colorectal (C Y9) module: Monocentric study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05524138

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Consultant Physician-Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-13 02:26

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-13 02:33

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read the manuscript of the article and I can say that the article is very informative in its data, the number of patients who have passed the questionnaire is also enough. I recommend the article for publication.