PEER-REVIEW REPORT

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good		[ ] Duplicate publication	
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[ ] No	[Y] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ ] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors demonstrated the predicting factor for LN metastasis in CRC. They showed 4 predicting factors including lymphatic invasion (difference AUC=0.204), the presence or absence of tumor budding (difference AUC=0.190), presence of PDCs (difference AUC=0.172) and tumor budding graded by the Ueno method (difference AUC=0.128). The present study was wel investigated and will give us an important information especially in the field of clinical gastroenterology. To improve the quality of this paper, they should revise it according to the following suggestions;   1) These AUC scores of 4 predictors were very low. The authors should perform the multiple logistic regression analysis of these factors to detect the best combination of 4 factors to predict LN metastasis.   2) As shown in Table 1, the depth of sm invasion determined by JSCCR or by Ueno significantly affect the incidence of LN metastasis. However, the authors did not indicate the conclusion. Please explain the significance of sm invasion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
Manuscript NO: 34785
Title: Novel predictors for lymph node metastasis in submucosal invasive colorectal carcinoma
Reviewer's code: 02445408
Reviewer's country: Cuba
Science editor: Yuan Qi
Date sent for review: 2017-05-26
Date reviewed: 2017-06-09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[　] Grade B: Very good	[　] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[　] The same title	[　] High priority for publication
[　] Grade C: Good	[　] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[　] Duplicate publication	[　] Rejection
[　] Grade D: Fair	[　] Grade D: Rejected	[　] Plagiarism	[　] Minor revision
[　] Grade E: Poor		[　] No	[　] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[　] The same title	
		[　] Duplicate publication	
		[　] Plagiarism	
		[　] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
To the authors Ortographic   page 5 line 10   ≥1000 mm it should be 1000 μm

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
Manuscript NO: 34785
Title: Novel predictors for lymph node metastasis in submucosal invasive colorectal carcinoma
Reviewer's code: 02445450
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Yuan Qi
Date sent for review: 2017-05-26
Date reviewed: 2017-06-10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[ ] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ ] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well-written manuscript showing predictive factors for lymph node metastasis of SICRC. If pathological definition of lymphatic invasion and venous invasion become more clearer that the discussion would become more precise. How did the authors distinguish lymphatic invasion from venous invasion only by HE stain? Did they use IHC analysis, such as D2-40 and CD34, for differentiation? Once it is classified as lymphatic invasion, what level of invasion was considered as positive?   Thank you.