

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 75353

**Title:** Poorly cohesive cells gastric carcinoma including signet-ring cell cancer: updated review of definition, classification and therapeutic management

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03731081

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-27 05:29

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-30 05:28

Review time: 2 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very relevant and interesting review manuscript. The authors studied a large number of articles (198). The authors also discussed histological, molecular genetic classifications of gastric cancer, reviewed and analyzed modern surgical, endoscopic, immune, radiation, chemotherapeutic, and targeted methods of treatment. An interesting assessment of the prognosis of the development of the disease. The manuscript is recommended for publication in the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 75353

**Title:** Poorly cohesive cells gastric carcinoma including signet-ring cell cancer: updated review of definition, classification and therapeutic management

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05232287

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-03 12:38

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-05 16:26

Review time: 2 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Drubay et al prepared a well-updated review on a very hot topic issue in gastric cancer research: signet ring cell histology. They explored throughly all the aspects of literature the SRC pattern, from histological to therapeutical point of view. The paper appears well organized, even if it is too long to read. Anyway, it includes all the informations according to specific histotype of gastric cancer. The review is well written and organized, but the reading is too poor of "Authors' perspectives" and I Would recommend the Authors to add several personal discussions to really improve as well as personalize the entire study. Additionally, some issues should addressed: - the abstract seems to be only a super-summary of the entire work. Since it is one of the most important part of work, I invite Authors rewrite it in a more attractive fashion and in present verbal form. - The reference number 1 is too old; please replace the epidemiological data with more recent reference; - Page 5 line 7: it is reported that studies reporting more/equal then 30 cases were prioritized. Since it is not clear, please delete this criterion or please state if paper with less then 30 cases were excluded. -Page 5: the last sentence "the definition...." should be deleted since it is a repetition of previous sentence. -Page 15: please check the sentence: "however, the definition of SRC in the FLOT..." since it is not clear why the presence any src is finally close to the recent definition of PCC-GC: it is wrong..... - Page 16:"A retrospective study suggested no tumor response of pure SRC-GC......", please specify in that study how is the definition of "pureSRC". - Pag 19 line 5: a total of 200 its with "localized"....: do you mean "non metastatic"? It would be better term to indicate that condition. -Pag. 21 paragraph 3.5.1. first sentence: "SRCC":please indicate these tumors as already used: SRC-GC - Please



correct mispelling errors throughout the paper - An English polishing would be appreciated - Please rewrite the "Conclusions" in a more"Arguing" fashion, highlithing the proposals forfeiture studies.