

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 83246

Title: The Research on Incorporating Perigastric Tumor Deposits into The TNM Staging of Primary Gastric Cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06082695

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-14 09:49

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-14 12:10

Review time: 2 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<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
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 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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

This article aims to investigate the effect of Perigastric Tumor Deposits on the prognosis of patients with primary gastric cancer. A total of 6672 patients undergoing gastrectomy were included in the study. The study found that patients with perigastric tumor deposits had a worse prognosis. The differences between TD-positive and TD-negative patients were analyzed using binary logistic regression modeling. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to plot survival curves. This study improved the TNM staging scheme, which is of great significance to clinical diagnosis and treatment.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 83246

Title: The Research on Incorporating Perigastric Tumor Deposits into The TNM Staging of Primary Gastric Cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03805084

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Lithuania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-21 16:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-21 16:33

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The scientific language needs to be substantially improved because some parts of the manuscript are difficult to read. No clear definitions. What is the difference between the tumor deposits and the carcinomatosis? How the location of the Tds was allocated? Some kind of diagram or figure is needed. Not clear methodology - cohort consists of more than 6000 patients, but then some 200-300 patients data is analyzed in TD positive and TD negative groups. Not clear. No chart-flow showing what patients were included in the study. In general, poor adherence to STROBE guidelines for reporting observational study data. No discussion of study limitations, such as study performed in Asian population, so the data might not be transferable to North American or European populations.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 83246

Title: The Research on Incorporating Perigastric Tumor Deposits into The TNM Staging of Primary Gastric Cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05753782

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-22 02:37

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-02 13:43

Review time: 10 Days and 11 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Title: • As this study is the prognostic role of perigastric tumour deposit, it is suggested to change to “Prognostic significance of perigastric tumour deposits in relation with TNM staging of primary gastric cancer”. **Abstract** • In results section, the sentence “No significant differences were detected between the two groups” is not clear. What significant? This sentence should be modified to be clear. **Methods** • In 1st paragraph, the sentence “TDs were defined as previously reported[13, 14]” ... This sentence is no need to be included in “Methods” as it has been stated in the background.

• In 2nd paragraph, the definition of TDs is no need to be mentioned in the methodology and it should be in the background. • Can histological types (Intestinal/Diffuse) be included in clinicopathological characteristics. It is good if the author includes it. **Results** • Table 1: Authors analysed relationship between survival and clinicopathological characteristic (age, sex, operation methods, grading and TNM staging) regardless of TDs. It is suggested to analyse the relationship between TDs and clinicopathological characteristic as this study is mainly prognostic significance of TDs.

Discussion • Generally, TDs are more common with diffuse histological type

compared with intestinal type. Authors did not discuss TDs in relation with histopathological types. It should be included in the discussion. • In 1st sentence of 3rd paragraph, what does it mean by “clinical physiology of GC”. It should be clinicopathological characteristics. • Limitation of the study and conclusion should be more elaborated. English language need to be edited.