PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 89548

Title: Computed tomography-based radiomics diagnostic approach for differential diagnosis between early- and late-stage pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05242485

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-05

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-06 23:13

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-19 20:45

Review time: 12 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [ ] 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

Authors built a radiomics model using CT datasets from a single institution to distinguish early-stage and late-stage pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. It is unclear though what the intended application would be for such a model. If the model only stages as early or late, can any clinical decision be made without TNM staging? On the other hand, if TNM staging is available, what is the value to the present model? Minor suggestions: 1) "included into the study" -> "included in the study"? 2) Line 5 of Page 2: "by reason of" -> "due to"? 3) Line 26 of Page 2: "and-or"->"and/or"? 4) Line 11 of Page 3: "making... management" -> "making... management decision"? 5) Line 21 of Page 3: Why was "biopsy proved PDAC" excluded? Weren't all cases pathologically PDAC? 6) Line 24 of Page 3: close parenthesis 7) Page 4, Line 12: "Following... features" -> "The following... features"? 8) Page 5, Line 3: "and portal venous phases" -> "and 396 from portal venous phases"? 9) Page 5, Line 11: Please define abbreviation RF here as it's referred to later in the manuscript. 10) "was showed" -> "was shown"; "were showed" -> "were shown" 11) Page 6, Lines 11--12: Please define abbreviations GLCM, GLSZM, and RLM. 12) Page 6, Line 31: remove "with which"? 13) Page 7: Should Ref. [16] be cited after Lines 15--17

instead of Lines 17--18? 14) Page 7, Lines 27--29: Does this statement deliver any useful information? Isn't the definition that M1 is Stage IV (thus late stage)? 15) Page 7, Lines 29--30: Please fix this sentence as well. Stage III does not allow distant metastasis by definition. 16) Page 8, Line 3: "support-vector machine based on CT texture analysis" -> "CT texture analysis based on support vector machine"? 17) Page 8, Line 19: remove "regarding"? 18) Page 8, Line 24: The readers are referred to the documentation of the code, which is NOT intrepretability! 19) Page 8, Line 30: "radiomiscs"->"radiomics"; remove "And"? 20) Page 8, Lines 33--34: grammar; "it only uses CT which is fast, low cost, and widely available"? 21) "dismal metastasis" -> "distal metastasis"? 22) Line 15 of Page 6 and Line 10 of Page 8: "Among which" -> "Among those" / "Among them"? 23) Line 22 of Page 6: remove ", respectively"? 24) Please label x and y axes of Fig. 3. 25) Fig. 4: How was "importance" defined? 26) Fig. 4C: Please show the color bar indicating how the colors correspond to values.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 89548

Title: Computed tomography-based radiomics diagnostic approach for differential diagnosis between early- and late-stage pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05242485

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-05

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-12 13:47

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-12 14:52

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	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for your effort in responding to my questions. For some of them, however, I can't see the direct answer to my question in your response. 1) MATERIALS AND METHODS, Patients: Why was "biopsy proved PDAC" excluded? One of your inclusion criteria was "pathologically proved PDAC". What is the difference between "biopsy proved" and "pathologically proved"? 2) Fig. 3: Can you please indicate what "x" and "y" axes mean? The readers need to know what quantities are plotted, and the unit, if applicable. 3) Please include the definition of "importance" in the manuscript.