

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 80653

Title: Local recurrence after successful endoscopic submucosal dissection for rectal mucinous mucosal adenocarcinoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06215370

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-08 12:41

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-08 14:06

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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

Thanks for sharing such an interesting case, but I have one question: The authors mentioned that the pathological result was mucinous adenocarcinoma with signet-ring cell carcinoma after the first rectal ESD procedure, and "Mucinous adenocarcinomas with signet-ring cell carcinomas are distinctively different from adenocarcinoma in their tumor biology and aggressive phenotype[5]". When the follow-up colonoscopy revealed possible recurrence, Why was EUS not performed for preoperative evaluation, such as the presence or absence of submucosal invasion? If EUS was performed as in most conditions, the Mile's operation might have been directly advised instead of the unnecessary second ESD procedure.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 80653

Title: Local recurrence after successful endoscopic submucosal dissection for rectal mucinous mucosal adenocarcinoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03604107

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Albania

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-08 19:18

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-10 17:11

Review time: 1 Day and 21 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a good paper, with an important theme. The language is good and details are convincing. I have nevertheless a major perplexity with regard to this paper: a case report cannot have 16 (sixteen) authors ! Maybe I have counted wrong; otherwise please clarify the role of each author (what contribution) to the editorial office.