

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 81908

Title: The examined lymph node count for gastric cancer patients after curative surgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03252941

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-29 23:13

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-02 13:53

Review time: 2 Days and 14 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review by Zeng et al. is a unique study regarding the examined lymph node (ELN) count for gastric cancer after curative resection. Various issues regarding factors that affect the number of ELN, impact of ELN numbers on pN staging and patients' prognoses, and problems in lymph node sorting technology are discussed. The subject is old-fashioned but is still important. The content is thought-provoking. I recommend this study be published in World Journal of Gastroenterology. I noticed some minor points and will list them up. 1. (p.6) In the same way, the total number of lymph nodes dissected in patients with early GC who underwent partial gastrectomy and with preserved function may be "increased" because parts of the perigastric lymph nodes do not need to be dissected: This may be "decreased." 2. (pp.6-7) Among cases with lymph node diameter of <6 and <4 mm, 14.9% and 4.2% showed a 25% decrease in staging, respectively: The meaning of this sentence is unclear. This had better be revised. 3. (p.10) than patients with "no less than" 15 lymph nodes after recurrence[44]: This may be "less than."

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 81908

Title: The examined lymph node count for gastric cancer patients after curative surgery

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03270518

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Professor, Surgeon, Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-28

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-04 17:55

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-11 11:12

Review time: 6 Days and 17 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The study presented by the Authors concerns a subject that has been much debated in the literature for many years. The work is well structured, examining many aspects. However, the conclusions do not bring anything new, usable in clinical practice, to the object under study. This is confirmed by the outdated bibliography. On page 6 replace "increased" with "decreased".