

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 77113

Title: Skeletal muscle metastasis from colorectal adenocarcinoma: A literature review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05342613

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-15 17:45

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-22 10:55

Review time: 6 Days and 17 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. YES 2 Abstract. YES. In conclusion- Is SMM a complication ? Or metastasis or entity?? 3 Key words. Should be added 4 Background. OK 5 Methods. Good 6 Results. OK 7 Discussion. Well discussed. But, there are less information about therapeutic approach. Please add some discussion for SMM and their progression using case reports (general aspect). 8 Illustrations and tables. OK 9 Biostatistics. OK. Suitable 10 Units. YES 11 References. Well 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. It is well documented, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Grammar needs some revision. There are some linguistic errors (Example See methodology in the abstract; tabulated ???) 13 Research methods and reporting. YES 14 Ethics statements. YES, obtain the requirements

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 77113

Title: Skeletal muscle metastasis from colorectal adenocarcinoma: A literature review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03706467

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor, Postdoc

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-18 08:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-25 10:11

Review time: 7 Days and 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 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

In the manuscript entitled "SKELETAL MUSCLE METASTASIS FROM COLORECTAL ADENOCARCINOMA: A LITERATURE REVIEW" authors have tried to present an interesting phenomenon that skeletal muscle metastasis from colorectal adenocarcinomas is a rare complication due to under-reporting. Early use of advanced imaging techniques like FDG-PET and a high index of clinical suspicion may increase the reporting. I have some minor comments to the text.

1. The writing is poor. Many of the formats are quite non-standard which is a serious problem in this article. Even taking into consideration that the writer is not a native English speaker, the wording throughout convolutes the messages they are trying to convey. For example , a. "Colorectal adenocarcinoma is the 3rd most common cancer in men and the 2nd most common cancer in women globally. It accounts for 10.7% of all new cancers and almost 10% of all cancer related deaths. ." b. "Colorectal cancer is the third most common cancer in men and the 2nd most commonest cancer in women. There were atleast 1.8 million new cases in the world in 2018. These account for more than 10.7% of all cancers ." c. "Inspite of this, the incidence of metastasis to skeletal muscles from all forms of cancers is extremely low."
2. When an abbreviation is first mentioned in the text, its full name should also be attached. For example, FDG-PET, PRISMA...
3. In this article, the author drew a graph without illustrations, but it is necessary.
4. "The initial search yielded 138 eligible studies. 29 of these studies were eligible for inclusion in our review. These studies covered a total of 30 patients. Detailed characteristics of the studies are shown in table 2." Is the small amount of data and limited coverage reflecting the clinical value of this study?
5. The article is too small to provide a clear understanding of skeletal muscle metastasis from colorectal adenocarcinomas, such as

their clinical presentation and prognosis. Nor does it go into detail about what ancillary tests are available and their significance for the early detection and diagnosis of skeletal muscle metastasis. Besides, the necessity and advanced nature of this research cannot be seen in this article. To make article more interesting, authors could write more about the analysis of the research and the clinical value of this article.