PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 63135

Title: Onodera's Prognostic Nutritional Index Is a Novel and Useful Prognostic Marker for Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumors

Reviewer's code: 05179236

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-20 21:21

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-21 02:45

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, Hao W et al. investigated the association between OPNI and RFS. Although the results seem to be informative in clinical practice, deep investigation and discussion is required to support the results. Several concerns are listed below; Introduction - Although the authors introduced NLR and PLR as relevant factor for tumor microenvironment, the association between NLR/PLR and OPNI is not clearly described. Why the authors focused on OPNI but not NLR/PLR? Methods - "H and E staining" would be Hematoxylin and eosin staining - Please add how the mitotic index was assessed Results - "A lower OPNI was associated with the primary tumor location" Please specify the location. - Table 4. Univariate analysis; As the OPNI is calculated from albumin and lymphocyte count, I am curious about the association between recurrence and these factors. - About the multivariate analysis, it will be better to check if the explanatory variables were not correlated. Discussion - Discussion about the association of low OPNI and high recurrence is not sufficient. - Please clarify "A low OPNI may be the result of hypoproteinemia and/or lymphopenia" - If low OPNI is associated with recurrence, how were low albumin level alone or lymphopenia alone related to recurrence? - OPNI is the index for nutritional status, that was revealed to be associated with poor survival. It is not fully discussed why the authors observe correlations between OPNI and RFS, since RFS may be determined by the factors relevant to tumor but not the host nutritional status. - Although the authors introduced NLR/PLR as inflammatory markers and showed the associations in univariate analysis, discussion about these results is lacking. - The authors referred the supplementation of branched chain amino acids to reduce tumor recurrence (ref.24), however this was done for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma with liver cirrhosis. The authors can not conclude with this reference that low albumin level was the reason for poor RFS in

patients with GIST.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 63135

Title: Onodera's Prognostic Nutritional Index Is a Novel and Useful Prognostic Marker for Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumors

Reviewer's code: 05907930

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Academic Research

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Argentina

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-18 11:20

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-22 23:40

Review time: 4 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the methods it would be worth detailing e.g., what the primary and secondary outcomes of this study were. - Overall a comprehensive and detailed manuscript suitable for publication.