

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 66792

**Title:** Clinical features and survival of patients with multiple primary malignancies

**Reviewer's code:** 05240100

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Hungary

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-08

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-15 06:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-15 07:20

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for the opportunity for reviewing this manuscript. Comments: Major: 1) Please, identify this study as a retrospective cohort study and adhere point-by-point to the relevant reporting guideline of the EQUATOR Network. 2) Was the sampling consecutive? How were the patients identified in medical databases? Altogether, how many cases with any malignancy were diagnosed at the clinic (of which 243 were eligible for inclusion) and what were the main reasons for exclusion? What about lack of data on follow-up/attrition? 3) I recommend including a third group of patients who were diagnosed with one primary tumor. This would allow you to make predictions of the development of multiple primary tumors as well, which would be a clinically meaningful information regarding follow-up. Besides, immortal time bias should be handled somehow. 4) I am not sure if the conclusion about having no difference in survival between the synchr. and metachr. groups holds in light of the relatively low number of the patients. Do you consider the statistical power of the analysis sufficient? Minor: typos should be amended.