

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 89466

Title: Uveal melanoma: Recent advances in immunotherapy

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06272301

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-03 07:53

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-06 08:51

Review time: 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty 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 novelty
Creativity or innovation 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 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 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 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

In this manuscript, the authors discussed new immunotherapy strategies for uveal melanoma. I suggest accepting this manuscript after they address the following concerns.

1. As a review, there should be a figure or table that allows the reader to better understand the core ideas of the paper. I suggest that the authors add a figure or table summarizing the immunotherapy strategies for UM.
2. Generally, narrative reviews will not have a "materials and methods" section. If the author writes this, please add a "discussion and results" title. At the same time, pay attention to the logical relationship between the titles at all levels. I think a lot of the "conclusion" is more about discussion or results
3. Abbreviations such as "OS" in the article only need to give the full name where they first appear, and only abbreviations are used elsewhere.
4. Authors can discuss in detail whether the unique genetic mutations and genetic changes of UM mentioned in the paper are specifically related to the selection of immunotherapy for UM.
5. This article has devoted a large part to the introduction of ICIs in the treatment of UM. However, the authors hardly mentioned other types of immunotherapies such as tumor vaccine and cell therapy, which is not in line with what the abstract said. It is

hoped that the authors could add these contents. 6. Although the authors list the results of many studies on UM immunotherapy, they do not give a specific summative strategy, which is they should add.