

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 88067

Title: Application of neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy and neoadjuvant chemotherapy in curative surgery for esophageal cancer: A meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746166

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-21 08:44

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-27 12:06

Review time: 6 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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 is a well structured manuscript and an interesting topic. The Authors explored the efficacy and reliability of nCRT and nCT in the prevention and treatment of EC, using three RCTs studies and 17 case-control and cohort studies to describe the course of treatment in detail with nCRT and nCT and to record changes in patients before and after treatment. The authors finally found the 3-year overall survival rate, pathological complete response rate, and R0 clearance rate of nCRT for EC were better than those of nCT, and the 3-year overall survival rate of esophageal squamous cell carcinoma was more obvious. It may provide an evidence-based medical basis for the treatment of patients with EC. The manuscript is a good meta-analysis. Good Introduction and materials and Methods. Relevant and informative images and tables. The Discussion sound well. Complete the References.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 88067

Title: Application of neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy and neoadjuvant chemotherapy in curative surgery for esophageal cancer: A meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746207

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-25 07:09

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-07 07:12

Review time: 12 Days

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
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 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 present study has impeccable methodology with illustrative figures, and a very concise discussion of the efficacy and safety of two neoadjuvant therapies in patients with EC based on the meta-analysis of relevant data, so as to provide an evidence-based medical basis for the treatment of patients with EC. The research ideas are clear and the work is serious. I have only few small remarks that authors should address properly. - Abstract should be presented within subsections i.e. background, method, results, as well as conclusion. - Core tip is missing. - You can improve the discussion part. Please summarize the findings of results. Congratulations on your excellent work. I recommend to accept the manuscript after minor revision.