

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 75162

Title: Clinical implications and mechanism of histopathological growth pattern in colorectal cancer liver metastases

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05908713

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-21 10:35

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-21 12:33

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 ☐ OnymousConflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The paper deals with an interesting argument and it is well written. Even if it does not produce any original finding, it could fit with the minireview form. The arguments are well exposed. I would change the title: it cannot be put in the foreground the clinical aspects, because in the text you show only future and not established clinical implications for HGP. I would also modify both the abstract (the entire second part of the abstract is a sort of general summary of the argument, not of your paper) and the conclusions in order to be less generic and more incisive: underline more practical aspects as well as true future perspectives in clinical practice. References are good, I would add a reference in pag 21 when you talk about therapy of colorectal liver metastases (survival, therapy of choice). Only minor revision

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 75162

Title: Clinical implications and mechanism of histopathological growth pattern in colorectal cancer liver metastases

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00503563

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-24 10:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-28 07:38

Review time: 3 Days and 21 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 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

The authors demonstrated the clinical importance of histopathological growth pattern (HGP) in patients with colorectal cancer liver metastases (CRCLM). Although this minireview has the clinical importance, there are several comments. Comments 1. Representative hematoxylin and eosin staining for dHGP and rHGP should be indicated as Figure. 2. Table 1 should be modified. The authors should indicate the real date of OS, PFS, and DFS.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 75162

Title: Clinical implications and mechanism of histopathological growth pattern in colorectal cancer liver metastases

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05118195

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Staff Physician, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-25 08:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-31 13:05

Review time: 6 Days and 4 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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: [<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

The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript, and the abstract summarizes the study. As a review, the manuscript describe the background of the study. Nevertheless, as a review, the manuscript make no original contributions in the field. The manuscript becomes cumbersome in extension. It might be good to reduce the too long text to adequate to the Journal review and make it more attainable to the reader. On the contrary, the Discussion fall short in the manuscript and more extension will be desirable. The tables are well displayed. References are appropriately cited, updated, and self-cited are correct. The prase ", and noninvasive methods identifying HGP futher" in the Abstract is not clear. IN pge 6, in HGPS AND THERAPIES "Yet, previous study showed..." must be "sutidies"