

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

**Manuscript NO:** 64774

Title: Modulated Electro-Hyperthermia in stage III and IV pancreatic cancer: results of

an observational study on 158 patients

Reviewer's code: 05345777 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-12 07:42

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-14 10:53

**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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ Y] 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



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https:**//www.wjgnet.com

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This observational pilot study provides effective evidence that mEHT association to chemotherapy can enhance its benefit in pancreatic cancer patients. Depite that these results are not verified in a large cohort study, we found it some decision-making roles to the treatment of pancreatic cancer. Combination of mEHT and chemotherapy might be effective therapy. However, there are still some questions. 1.PR, CR, PD should be clarified in methodology. 2.Age should not be considered an issue, since the improvement of survival and tutor response was observed also in older patients (>65 years) with locally advanced pancreatic cancer. Why did the authors not conduct subgroup analysis? Does age interfere with research results? 3.In Overall survival (OS) analysis, the survival curve is crossed, please explain the reason and make further analysis. 4.The authors demostrated some imbalances distribution between the two subgroups as concerning number of patients and median age. What effect and influence will have on the stability of the results?



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

**Manuscript NO:** 64774

Title: Modulated Electro-Hyperthermia in stage III and IV pancreatic cancer: results of

an observational study on 158 patients

Reviewer's code: 02936529 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FRCS (Hon), MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-15 13:57

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-15 14:40

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous  Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No



https://www.wjgnet.com

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This observational study aims to compare mainly disease-free outcomes of chemotherapy versus its association with electro-hyperthermia for the treatment of locally advanced pancreatic cancer (stage III-IV): Despite of the potential bias inherent to the retrospective nature of the study and as consequence a general heterogenicity of the population in analysis... its is a very well-designed study, with proper statistical methods and minor english discordances.... the review about the subject was widely performed...and the conclusions of the study was properly in accordance with the proposed methods and analysis.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

**Manuscript NO:** 64774

Title: Modulated Electro-Hyperthermia in stage III and IV pancreatic cancer: results of

an observational study on 158 patients

Reviewer's code: 05469117 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Chief Physician, Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-14 12:10

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-19 17:05

**Review time:** 5 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] 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)</li><li>[ ] Minor revision</li><li>[ ] Rejection</li></ul>
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous  Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No



https://www.wjgnet.com

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1.In ABSTRACT(page5), what's the difference between "locally advanced pancreatic cancer (line10)" and "stage III-IV pancreatic cancer (line13)"? Please clarify the tumor staging method. 2. Page11, According to the drug instructions, gemcitabine has a half-life of 42-94 minutes, and gemcitabine is completely eliminated within 5-11 hours after infusion. How to combine high drug blood concentration with the modulated electro hyperthermia and optimize their synergy if mEHT was administered after CHT or within 48 hours? 3. Page12 line1-2, What is the version of RECIST? Is it version 1.4? 4.3. Page13, Some differences were found between CHT+ mEHT and CHT groups in median age (64 vs 69 years, p= 0.013), previous RT (2% vs 12%, P=0.023), number of previous CHT lines (2 lines: 19% vs 35%, p=0.037) and type of chemotherapy. Gemox was the most used chemotherapy in CHT+ mEHT group (p=0.004), whereas FOLFOX and FOLFIRINOX were used only in CHT group (p<0.05). Are the two groups comparable? In particular, the two groups of chemotherapy efficacy is different.



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 64774

Title: Modulated Electro-Hyperthermia in stage III and IV pancreatic cancer: results of

an observational study on 158 patients

Reviewer's code: 05469117 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Chief Physician, Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-23

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-23 13:04

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-23 15:37

**Review time:** 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ Y] No



We agree with the chief editor's opinion and the patient's revision o