

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 85607

Title: Effect of two surgical approaches on the lung function and prognosis of patients with combined esophagogastric cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06503248

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-26 00:43

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-08 09:43

Review time: 13 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 statements	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

Currently, surgical resection remains the main treatment for adenocarcinoma of the esophagogastric junction, with a transthoracic approach recommended for Siewert I adenocarcinoma of the esophagogastric junction and a transabdominal approach recommended for Siewert III adenocarcinoma of the esophagogastric junction for complete resection of gastric cancer. However, the optimal surgical approach for Siewert II adenocarcinoma of the esophagogastric junction remains inconclusive. This study was designed to investigate the surgical effect, postoperative pulmonary function changes, and prognostic differences between two approaches for treating combined esophagogastric cancer. The design of this study is excellent and the methods are described in detail. Findings of the study is interesting and well discussed. In my opinion, this study can be accepted for publication after a minor revision. Comments: 1. The manuscript requires a minor editing. Some minor language polishing should be revised. 2. The authors have to short the results section in the abstract. 3. Figure 2 and figure 3 should be combined into one panel.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 85607

Title: Effect of two surgical approaches on the lung function and prognosis of patients with combined esophagogastric cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06120613

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-30 00:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-12 00:36

Review time: 12 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 statements	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

In this study, totally one hundred and thirty-eight patients with combined esophagogastric cancer treated by general surgery and thoracic surgery were selected as the study subjects. The indexes related to surgical trauma, the number of removed lymph nodes, the indexes of lung function before and after surgery, the survival rate and survival time at 3 years after surgery were compared. The results of this study are interesting. The authors find that transabdominal and transthoracic surgical approaches are comparable in treating combined esophagogastric cancer. Overall, the manuscript is well written. The reviewer suggests to accept this manuscript after an editing of language, tables, and references list.