



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 46926

Title: Colorectal peritoneal metastases: Optimal management review

Reviewer’s code: 00183059

Reviewer’s country: Japan

Science editor: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-14 11:13

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-15 12:57

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper demonstrated review articles about peritoneal dissemination of colorectal cancer. This article includes the contents from the diagnosis of this disease, treatment and to the future prospective. This paper was well-written and very useful article as a textbook. Therefore, I decided this study should be accepted in the journal of “World



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Journal of Gastroenterology”.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 46926

Title: Colorectal peritoneal metastases: Optimal management review

Reviewer’s code: 02954382

Reviewer’s country: Kosovo

Science editor: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-12 10:17

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-20 20:57

Review time: 8 Days and 10 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Reviewer’s report Title: Colorectal carcinomatosis: Optimal management and future perspectives Date: March 20, 2019 Reviewer's report: Some type errors, through the manuscript, should be corrected by authors. a) In the section “State of the art” TMN should be corrected in TNM (tumor- node- metastasis) b) In the section “Clinical



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Presentation of Peritoneal Metastases from Colorectal Cancer” the part of the sentence “with a 5-year survival of 93-72%” should be corrected in “with a 5-year survival of 72-93%”. c) The word “Colorrectal cancer” should be corrected in “Colorectal cancer”. d) In the section “Conclusions” on the second line the abbreviation “CCR” should be corrected in “CRC”

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? The title of the manuscript should be changed from “Colorectal carcinomatosis: Optimal management and future perspectives” to “ Peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer: Optimal management and future perspectives”.

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Introduction generally is ok, but at the end of this section, the authors should added what they aimed by this review. Other sections of this review are well designed, prescribing and analyzed the latest information about Peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal origin, and current management of this entity. The sections named “ Neoadjuvancy” and “Adjuvancy” should be corrected by authors in “ Neoadjuvant chemotherapy”, and “Adjuvant chemotherapy”, respectively.

5 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? The tables and figures are OK.

6 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? In this manuscript are cited the latest, important, and relevant references.

7 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Generally Yes.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 46926

Title: Colorectal peritoneal metastases: Optimal management review

Reviewer's code: 02982391

Reviewer's country: Saudi Arabia

Science editor: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-15 08:17

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-30 05:31

Review time: 14 Days and 21 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Colorectal carcinomatosis: Optimal management and future perspectives I read with great interest the above titled review. However, there are several problems in the manuscript 1. The manuscript looks like a chapter of a book rather than a review submitted to a medical/scientific journal. The authors should have an abstract. The flow



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

of writing and the format of the manuscript should be reviewed to match with a review style. 2. Introduction: The flow of writing is not well organized, and there are sudden shifts. We need to know the rationale of the review. Why this review was written, what is the focus, and research questions to be answered, or the framework that the authors will address in this review. Some statements need to have references. 3. Page 3: out of n where there is a jump into recommendations management of PMs on emergency surgery. 4. The different parts are not connected and the readers will find it difficult to follow. It looks like a bad summary of a book. The subtitles are not connected. We do not write subtitles like CRS + HIPEC, in a scientific review. 5. The Follow-up and future lines of research are not clearly written. 6. Conclusions: this should be carefully written to give a meaningful conclusive summary. What is the prognosis? 7. References: The list of references should be reviewed. For example, ref number 23, should be a proper research paper. What is the rule for placing et al? in reference 39 I see it placed after 6 authors, and in ref 37 and ref 101, placed after 3 authors, What is the trouble with ref 58? 8. The main problems are: not writing in a format of a journal review, no abstract, difficult to read, sudden jumps, recommendations given on page 3, not organized, current and future research is not well written, the conclusion is meaningless, and looks like a bad summary of a book.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- [] The same title
- [] Duplicate publication
- [] Plagiarism
- [Y] No



Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No