

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 81527

Title: Survival benefits and disparities in radiation therapy for elderly patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06140413

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-17 08:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-20 10:33

Review time: 3 Days and 1 Hour

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No |
|-------------------------------------|---|

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Sir, I read with interest the manuscript entitled " Survival benefits and disparities in radiation therapy for elderly patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma". The manuscript is well designed and written. The introduction gives a good overview about the topic and the procedures are precisely described. The results were well discussed. However, some issues have to be addressed: 1. The images and tables are relevant and informative, and the conclusion tries to highlight the survival benefit of RT in elderly patients with PDAC on a larger population scale and proposes possible obstacles to accessing treatment for elderly patients with PDAC. Editing and proofreading are needed to maintain the best sense of reading; 2. The discussion section is general and should discuss the results of this present study more precisely; 3. and main issue: The conclusion of the study is a little too broad and too simple. The conclusion needs more targeted generalization of the whole study and can be more profound. Thank you for giving the opportunity to review this manuscript.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 81527

Title: Survival benefits and disparities in radiation therapy for elderly patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06058939

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-17 08:47

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-21 09:39

Review time: 4 Days

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No |
|-------------------------------------|---|

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript Title: Survival benefits and disparities in radiation therapy for elderly patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. 1- Title reflected the main subject of the manuscript. 2- The abstract summarized and reflect the described in the manuscript. 3- Key words reflected the focus of the manuscript. 4- The manuscript adequately described the background, presented status and significance of the study. 5- The manuscript described methods (e.g., Population Selection, Variables and Definition of Endpoint, Statistical Analysis, etc.) in adequate detail. 6- The research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. Authors investigate the use and effectiveness of RT in the treatment of elderly patients with PDAC in clinical practice. 7- The manuscript interpreted the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. 8- Manuscript included sufficient, good quality Tables and Figures. 9- The manuscript cited appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. 10- The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented and the style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriated.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 81527

Title: Survival benefits and disparities in radiation therapy for elderly patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06140361

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-17 08:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-22 08:43

Review time: 4 Days and 23 Hours

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Language quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript explored the use and effectiveness of RT in the treatment of elderly patients with PDAC in clinical practice. The topic has a clinical relevance since the older patients represent a unique subgroup of the cancer patient population, for which the role of cancer therapy requires special consideration. Although the idea of the study is not novel enough, however, the manuscript is well written: the title reflects the main subject of the article, abstract and keywords well summarize the arguments. The methodology is described in detail and is well structured. Data were extracted from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database to identify factors associated with RT administration and explore the impact of RT on survival in elderly PDAC patients. The discussion is well articulated according to results and the authors have clearly underlined the limitations and drawbacks of the manuscript. A point of strength of the article in my opinion is also that it provides a potential and effective strategy for PDAC clinical treatments. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest and authoritative references. Reading the manuscript some minor concerns have emerged: •Fig. 1 and Fig. 4 are not clear. •It is recommended to add more discussion on prognostic factors in the discussion section.