PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Some issues are raised. 1. In the middle of a "RELATED STUDIES BASED ON IMMUNE TARGET" section, the type of MSI must be defined. Is MSI low or high? 2. The review defined MSI-L type as a cold tumor. However, in the contents, only the research targeting the MSI-H type is described. The MSI-H type CRC is highly responsive to immunotherapy, therefore it could not be defined as a cold tumor. It is considered to be contrary to the purpose of this review. 3. A summary of clinical studies to overcome immune resistance in patients with MSI-L colorectal cancer is needed.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 80224

Title: Therapeutic challenge for immunotherapy targeting cold colorectal cancer： A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05226306

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MBBS, MCh, MNAMS

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-16 12:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-16 13:02

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The title does not indicate the manuscript is a review article 2. The review does not mention the methodology of the articles selected and the mode of selection 3. Any conflict of interest declared ? 4. What does the review add to the existing knowledge? 5. There is no concluding remarks noted in the manuscript

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

The article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with an interesting topic.   It is well written and the reading is fluent.   The article reviews the state of the art regarding immunotherapy targeting colorectal cancer.   However, to be accepted it must be improved in several aspects: a) It must indicate how the bibliographic review has been carried out and what type of review is being carried out. The sources where the references have been obtained, the search criteria... b) A discussion section should be included where the references found are systematized and the review is discussed: what are the lines of work, what advances are made on the above and where the next advances could go,... c) The main contributions of the research and the lines of future work must be included in the conclusions.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 80224

Title: Therapeutic challenge for immunotherapy targeting cold colorectal cancer： A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05382551

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-14 01:28

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-14 01:34

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] 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 |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper can be accepted in current for