PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 65963

Title: The relation between skeletal muscle volume and prognosis in rectal cancer patients undergoing neoadjuvant therapy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05119548

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-19 02:11

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-19 22:57

Review time: 20 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [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

It is not novel findings because of review article. But this manuscript has the quite quality.   The authors defined sarcopenia using skeletal muscle mass assessed by imaging examination and not evaluation of muscle quality for example using grip strength. This is not true diagnosis as sarcopenia.   The title of this article should be revised   as "The relation between skeletal muscle volume and prognosis in rectal cancer patients undergoing neoadjuvant therapy".

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 65963

Title: The relation between skeletal muscle volume and prognosis in rectal cancer patients undergoing neoadjuvant therapy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02978709

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBChB, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Denmark

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-19 07:26

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-22 13:57

Review time: 3 Days and 6 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) [Y] Minor revision [ ] 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

I would suggest to include a flowchart about how studies were selected to this review

Please, make the conclusion shorter and more focused on the findings from this study