PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 67745

Title: Novel molecular panel for evaluating systemic inflammation and survival in therapy naïve glioma patients

Reviewer's code: 04089095

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-17 03:21

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-27 06:49

Review time: 10 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
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) [Y] Minor revision [ ] 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

In this manuscript, the author estimated the circulating inflammatory indicators Kynurenine, IL-6, tissue-inhibitor of matrix-metalloproteinase-1(TIMP-1) and hTERT along with neutrophil-lymphocyte-ratio(NLR). The aim of the present study was to assess the utility of chosen inflammatory marker panel in estimating systemic inflammation. This paper is written smoothly with clear thinking, but there are some problems: 1. On the fourth page, the sixteenth line, it's not clear what the author meant by using "unresolved inflammation". 2. On the third page, the first line, "Multivariate linear-regression analysis confirmed the association with inflammation marker IL-6". This sentence doesn't make sense. 3. In the sixth line and the twentieth line of the fifth page, "suggest" should be "suggested". 4. The research sample should have clear exclusion and inclusion criteria. 5. On the eighth page, "the best value was for IL-6 (r=0.5409, p<0.0001)". What is the meaning of this sentence? No relevant data can be seen in the table behind the article. 6. In the eighth line of page 9, the article is described as Table 4, but the name of the table at the end of the article is Table no.3. Moreover, the value of hTERT is not seen in the table. 7. There is no relevant table data for the paired t-test between the preoperative and 3-month postoperative levels during the follow-up mentioned on page 10. Overall, I think this article is clearly organized, but there are also some problems. I think this article needs to be reviewed again after revision.