

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 89490

Title: Comparison of mismatch repair and immune checkpoint protein profile with histopathological parameters in pancreatic, periampullary/ampullary, and choledochal adenocarcinomas

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05852316

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-03

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-26 04:22

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-28 03:56

Review time: 1 Day and 23 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

1. Pancreatic, periampullary/ampullary and choledochal adenocarcinomas are aggressive malignancies with recurrences and metastases in short time and complete resection is possible in a small group. So, targeted therapy agents are needed in these patients. HHLA2, an analogous of PD-1, is a recently discovered member of the B7/CD28 family and is expressed in many malignancies. Evaluation of HHLA2 expression in microsatellite stable (MSS) and PD-L1 negative tumors may be useful in predicting the possible response of individuals to immunotherapy and may take its place as a target step in advanced cases that do not respond to classical chemotherapy protocols and have no chance of resection.

2. What is the relationship between expression MMR and HHLA2? The relationship between PD-L1 and HHLA2 was not explained in the article. Is there a relationship between PD-L1 and HHLA2? Is HHLA more advantageous than PD-L1?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 89490

Title: Comparison of mismatch repair and immune checkpoint protein profile with histopathological parameters in pancreatic, periampullary/ampullary, and choledochal adenocarcinomas

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06125275

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Algeria

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-03

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-27 19:18

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-28 09:57

Review time: 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] 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

Can you adjunct in the abstract section a short discussion, because you can go on till 250 words. Because in the IMRAD criteria introduced by L. Pasteur, an abstract must contain a discussion. The retrospective character of the study must be mentioned at the end of the discussion as a limit of this study.