

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 68081

**Title:** Comparison of tumor regression grading systems for locally advanced gastric adenocarcinoma after neoadjuvant chemotherapy

Reviewer's code: 03647881

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-12

Reviewer chosen by: Li Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-16 13:03

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-21 11:44

Review time: 4 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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



## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No special comments, thanks.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 68081

**Title:** Comparison of tumor regression grading systems for locally advanced gastric adenocarcinoma after neoadjuvant chemotherapy

Reviewer's code: 03806663

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-12

Reviewer chosen by: Li Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-24 14:25

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-28 13:19

Review time: 3 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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



## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

it is an interesting topic, but there are some comments that i had mentioned below: 1-some pathological abbreviations need clarifications. 2- please add degree of freedom for each p value. 3- as regards figures, please add scale bar, annotations, magnification, type of stain,.. 4- why neuronal invasion not included in the pathological report