Baishideng Publishing Group

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 81750

Title: Efficacy and outcome of extensive intraoperative peritoneal lavage plus surgery vs surgery alone with advanced gastric cancer patients

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06349571

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-27 06:06

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-10 13:11

Review time: 13 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] 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 randomized controlled study, the efficacy and outcome of Extensive Intraoperative Peritoneal Lavage (EIPL) in advanced gastric cancer patients were analyzed. Although there are similar studies in the literature on this subject, this study is considered to be valuable with its prospective randomized design and perioperative and long-term survival results.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. There are too many words in the author's abstract, and the key points of the article are not well summarized. 2. What is the meaning of β in Supplementary Tables S5 and S6? 3. The predicted results and the accuracy of the model should be validated by random cohorts or external cohorts. 4. The statistical analysis section should explain in more detail the processing and analysis of the data. 5. In the Discussion, comparisons should be made with findings from recent years. 6. The format and language of the article should be further revised.