

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 91460

**Title:** Comparative effectiveness of immunotherapy and chemotherapy in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer stratified by microsatellite instability status

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06187298

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Chief Physician, Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-12-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-01-12 14:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-01-13 17:35

**Review time:** 1 Day and 2 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 Grade E: Do not publish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

<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 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPT ID: 91460-43253 Congratulations for this interesting large cohort retrospective study on patients with metastatic colorectal cancer, especially that it focuses on microsatellite instability. From this study surgeons and oncologists can benefit alike. This is my report regarding the submitted paper: 1. Title. - The title does reflect properly the content of the manuscript and the type of research. - Please clarify the running subtitle, as it is too short (LINE 11). 2. Abstract. The structured abstract reflects very well all aspects of the manuscript, with clear subchapters. 3. Key Words. Well chosen. 4. Introduction. This section is well constructed and has sufficient number of citations. 5. Material and methods. - This section is well constructed and contains all important subsections. - Please explain what C18 and C20 DRG diagnosis codes mean (LINE 171) so that non-clinical medical staff can better understand. - Please explain why you chose the 20 mm marker for bifurcation of the study group, so readers that are not surgeons or oncologists can better understand the research (LINE 173). - Please add some details on the software used, besides the commercial name (LINE 201), such as website, etc. 6. Results. This section is very well constructed in subsections. 7. Discussion.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** office@baishideng.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Well-constructed and contains sufficient references; the timespan of these references is also adequate. 8. Illustrations and tables. - Well designed, with clear labels and indications. - The provided tables are well drafted and provide a sufficient level of clarity. - Please explain why it is important for the current study the type of insurance status (TABLE 1, LINE 17 to 22). It adds no medical or scientific significance, so please remove them. 9. Biostatistics. All relevant information regarding the statistical analysis was provided, but a dedicated document drafted by a certified biostatistics engineer, to validate the data, was not submitted. Please submit one. 10. Units. All units are drafted in SI system. 11. References. The list of 23 references is small but adequate, and so is the timespan. 12. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. It is fit for publication, after minor changes have been implemented. 13. Backmatter section. Please state each author`s contribution, according to CRediT taxonomy (LINE 25). 14. Ethics statements. Please provide an ethics committee approval document for this study. 15. English language: The quality of English language is consistently good throughout the entire text. CONCLUSION The manuscript requires minor changes before being considered for publication. Date, 13.01.2024