

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World	Journal	of Gastrointestinal	Oncology
-------------------------------	---------	---------------------	----------

Manuscript NO: 66297

Title: Trimodality treatment in gastric and gastroesophageal junction cancers: Current

approach and future perspectives

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05186738 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Physician, Director, Surgeon, Surgical

Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-25 23:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-26 02:52

Review time: 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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	[Y] Accept (High priority)[] Minor revision[] Rejection



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Charalampakis et al. reviewed the existing data on trimodality approaches for gastric and gastroesophageal junction cancers, they also made comments on the remaining questions and presented the current research effort addressing them. This is a good review. I suggest the number of authors are reduced to no more than five. The language needs polishing a little bit.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 66297

Title: Trimodality treatment in gastric and gastroesophageal junction cancers: Current

approach and future perspectives

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03003481 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-29 13:08

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-31 13:44

Review time: 2 Days

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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No



Baishideng Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Charalampakis and colleagues performed a comprehensive review on previous study and current progress on the treatment GC and GEJC. The review is generally wellwritten with few grammar mistakes or typos, and provides a panorama on treatment of the specific cancers. The article is well-orgnized with clear structure and appropriate language. There are only some minor corrections, as listed below: 1.Page 2: 'understanding has improved of phenotypic and genotypic correlations', of should be 2.Page 3: is there any environmental or genetic factors for diffuse type? 3.Page 5, last paragraph: What is the significance of molecular subtyping in therapy, especially immunotherapy? 4.Page 6, last paragraph: 'can be classified according to the Siewert type I', in should be into? 5.Page 7, first line: 'wheras' should be classification, in 'whereas' 6.Page 7,'wheras D2 is when all N1 and N2 nodes (distant perigastric nodes and nodes along main arteries supplying the stomach) are removed (25). ' please rephrase the sentence. 7.Page 8, 2nd line: Should provide the details on response improvement. 8. Page 8, 2nd paragraph: 'addition of radiotherapy', is this combination 9.Page 8, 2nd paragraph: Why some patients did not recieve postor sequential? surgical adjuvant therapy, which should be a routine for T3 patients. paragraph: is preoperative hypoalbuminemia an independent risk factor? is it a predictive marker? 11.Page 11, 2nd paragraph: a summary of main findings should be added. 12.Page 11, 4th paragraph: Was there any benifit using radiotherapy? Need to brief the results. 13. Page 17, 1st paragraph: a summary is needed for this section as there are many studies 14. Page 18, 1st paragraph: a summary is needed. 15.Page 20, 1st paragraph: a summary is needed. 16.Page 23, 2nd paragraph: a summary is needed.



17. Page 25, conclusion: The role of radiotherapy is one main focus of the review, should make conclusions on radiotherapy.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 66297

Title: Trimodality treatment in gastric and gastroesophageal junction cancers: Current

approach and future perspectives

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05873464 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-26 08:31

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-06 07:37

Review time: 10 Days and 23 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 [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



https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors: The manuscript is about the trimodality treatment in gastric and gastroesophageal junction cancers. In general, it introduces some current treatments and ongoing clinical studies. But it is regrettable that there exist significant weaknesses which need to be revised. 1. In "Treatment" part, the logical relationship among sub-headings is confused. For example, on page 7, in "Synergy of chemotherapy and radiotherapy - The role of immunotherapy" part, the authors mainly described the combination treatment of surgery, radiotherapy and chemotherapy, so this sub-heading and the header content are obviously inappropriate. Therefore, the authors should list the several main modes of trimodality treatment, and then describe them in turn. 2. In "Histology" part, the authors should supplement the relationship between esophageal carcinoma and gastroesophageal junction carcinoma, and then describe the histological 3. At the end of the text, the authors should discuss their prospects of this features. field. 4. There are some spelling and grammar mistakes in the text that need to be corrected (see attached files). 5. Please write numbers in Arabic numerals or English, do not mix.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 66297

Title: Trimodality treatment in gastric and gastroesophageal junction cancers: Current

approach and future perspectives

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02729532 **Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-26 01:50

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-08 08:08

Review time: 13 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] 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

Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

 $Nice\ article.\ Congratulations.$