

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75007

Title: Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy and colorectal cancer: From physiology to surgery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05776309

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-13

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Qi Zhu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-19 18:46

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-29 22:35

Review time: 10 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Generally the manuscript can be published

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75007

Title: Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy and colorectal cancer: From physiology to surgery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04089095

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-13

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Qi Zhu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-17 13:30

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-05 05:59

Review time: 17 Days and 16 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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this paper, the author trying to summarize the most relevant evidences on the use of CRC and to specify the main properties of HIPEC and CytoReductive Surgery (CRS) and their application. Although there are relevant studies and experiments, there is no clear conclusion about which group of patients can benefit from the the bimodal treatment (CRS + HIPEC) against local and advanced CRC. This will also become the direction and focus of future research. The content of the article is relatively smooth, but there are still the following problems: Question1: In page5, the subtitle of this part is “HIPEC and technique”, but most of the content is telling the Heat Shock Proteins (HSPs) and related physiological processes and mechanisms, it is suggested that the author consider changing the title of this summary to “HIPEC and physiological mechanism”. Question2: About the section headings, “HIPEC and Technique” “HIPEC Technique and Protocols for CRC”, the content of the two headings were part of repeat, the author is advised to modify the subtitles. Question3: It is suggested that the author include more updated references in the article. In general, I think this article can be accepted after modification. The final decision should be at the editor's discretion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75007

Title: Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy and colorectal cancer: From physiology to surgery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03478404

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-13

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-05 12:44

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-09 17:00

Review time: 4 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: [☒] Anonymous [☐] Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I appreciate the hard work the study group invested in this review. Basically, they intended to analyze the results presented in different reviews/systematic reviews on the effects of bimodal therapy (Hyperthermic IntraPERitoneal Chemotherapy and CytoReductive Surgery) on local and advanced CRC. I sincerely hope my remarks will be taken as being constructive and will become useful for a revision. I have listed some suggestions for consideration below: 1. Title – mentions only HIPEC; moreover “HIPEC and Colo-rectal Cancer: from Physiology to Surgery” – appears a bit confusing – Physiology of colo-rectal cancer? Alternatively, why not use “HIPEC and CytoReductive Surgery in colorectal cancer” ? 2. Abstract: The following sentences require revision, as they conflict with each other :” Even if the concept still not very clear and shared, after a careful evaluation of the published data, and after some technical and pathophysiological descriptions, we concluded that it is possible to grow the overall survival, quality of life (QoL) and to reduce the tumor relapse in patients affected by locally advanced (pT4) CRC with peritoneal metastases (PMs). From several studies, it seems that the efficacy of bimodal treatment with an accurate CRS can extend overall survival. Despite some studies, there is no still any straight evidence about the use of combined treatment in patients with CRC.” The conclusion is written in the middle while, in the end, there is still uncertainty. Please revise, correct and also improve the quality of the English language. Please make it more concise and clearer. 3. The structure of the manuscript is somehow difficult to be followed. Data could be more logically arranged. A. Introduction mentions many details about HIPEC, in some cancers. However, there are some other paragraphs, describing HIPEC. Please focus on



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

important aspects and mention only principal data. Also, please describe the abbreviations PM and PMs, before using them. PMs are explained in the Abstract, but not in the main text, only by the end of the Introduction, while they have been used before. B. Material and Methods: The authors wrote “Our revision work has focused the attention on HIPEC, from its first uses to now, looking at principal uses in different tumors like gastric, ovaric and colo-rectal.”. First, this is not a “revision”. Also, “ovaric” is misspelled. Plus, this review should have focused on colorectal cancer. Please also correct “Our study” with “Our review”. C. HIPEC and CRC – these data could be nicely harmonized into Introduction. D. HIPEC and TECHNIQUE – This paragraph is not really about technique. Also, it contains some redundant data. Please revise and summarize. D. HIPEC Technique and Protocols for CRC – Please revise this title as it is a repeat of the previous “HIPEC and Technique” which, in fact, is not much about Technique. This paragraph also presents five studies but not commenting on anything. Please discuss the data. E. CONCLUSION paragraph is not supported by the data presented in the text. Table 1 does not contain explanations. Conclusion should be short and crispy and based on the data presented and commented in the review. Conclusion should not contain references. What do we learn from this review? 4. Figure 2: Please correct the title to “Countries participating in clinical trials” 5. Major revision of the English language is required. 6. Maybe it would be useful to insert a list of abbreviation, given the many abbreviations used in the text. 7. References do not respect the requested format and are not uniformly written. Please correct. 8. Please also insert ORCID for the Authors, according to the requirements of the journal. 9. Also, there are no « Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form » and « Copyright License Agreement ». Please insert.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75007

Title: Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy and colorectal cancer: From physiology to surgery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03478404

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-13

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-26 10:01

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-26 12:14

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Honestly, these revised materials are not clear. First, there is no point-by-point answer to the reviewers' suggestions/comments. The authors just wrote "Following the Reviewer suggestion, we have now revised the manuscript". This is not the usual way. Please provide clear answers to comments/suggestions, so that it appears clear what the authors' opinions were, what the authors decided not to modify and why. Second, the authors wrote "All new parts in the text are marked in red.". However, in what they sent as "Manuscript file" - "75007_Auto_Edited", there is nothing in red and there are not many modifications. However, I found the text with some corrections in red titled as "Supplementary Material" - "75007-Supplementary-Material-revision". What is confusing is that this text (Supplementary...) contains the modifications (title, list of abbreviations), but lacks other features (format of the text and references) and other modifications that are found in "Manuscript file" - "75007_Auto_Edited". Please revise carefully both files and unify them into a final manuscript. Third, I do not see much improvement of the paper. Also, I previously wrote "Figure 2: Please correct the title to "Countries participating in clinical trials"". However, it is still "Nations participating clinical trials" (image in PowerPoint). It is not the same. Besides, spelling is incorrect. I still do not see ORCID for the authors in none of the materials.