PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 78112

Title: Predictive value of a serum tumor biomarkers scoring system for clinical stage II/III rectal cancer having neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02728463

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Lithuania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-08 08:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-12 08:02

Review time: 3 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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 [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: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors,   I would like to congratulate you with this fine study. However, I have few comments.   INTRODUCTION --I do not think you need to talk on TNT here - it is not the aim of your article. --I would include here or in the DISCUSSION the review article on biomolecules as a prognostic factors - Smolskas E, Mikulskytė G, Sileika E, Suziedelis K, Dulskas A. Tissue-Based Markers as a Tool to Assess Response to Neoadjuvant Radiotherapy in Rectal Cancer-Systematic Review. Int J Mol Sci. 2022 May 27;23(11):6040.   MATERIALS and METHODS --It is not clear to me was is a retrospective study (last paragraph) or prospective (first paragraph)? --Abbreviation NCCN should be defined. --Same with OS. --SPSS manufacturer, city should be included. --Score 1 - what are those "other situations"?   RESULTS --CRM definition -- "didn't have" these kind of shortenings must be avoided.   DISCUSSION --some mistype errors should be corrected (didn't, robustest, etc) --if the predictive value was weaker than pTNM, which is always known, what is the purpose of performing additional tests?   I would suggest combining all the factors and preparing some nomogram for the precise prognosis. Major limitations: small single center retrospective study with the significant drop-off of the patients.

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 [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	[ ] Yes [Y] No

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study has been done before   The prognostic value of a novel serum tumor biomarkers scoring system for clinical Stage II/III rectal cancer patients undergoing neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy followed by total mesorectal excision The tile is too long it can be : The prognostic value of a novel serum tumor biomarkers scoring system for clinical Stage II/III rectal cancer having neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy. Do you mean prognostic or predictive value? Pathological response can be evaluated by endoscopic biopsy