



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Experimental Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 96318

Title: Therapeutic Strategies and Prognostic Challenges in Linitis Plastica

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 08142506

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2024-05-03

Reviewer chosen by: Meng-Hua Liu (Quit 2024)

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-09-18 01:20

Reviewer performed review: 2024-09-18 01:36

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The editorial addresses the challenges and advancements in treating Linitis Plastica (LP), a rare and aggressive form of gastric cancer. Despite its low incidence, LP accounts for a significant number of gastric cancer-related deaths due to its poor prognosis and resistance to conventional treatments. The authors, Grigorios Christodoulidis and colleagues, highlight the need for early detection and personalized treatment strategies to improve outcomes for LP patients. The authors may consider below comments and suggestion for improving the manuscript. Strengths: 1. Comprehensive Overview: The manuscript provides a thorough overview of Linitis Plastica (LP), highlighting its aggressive nature and the challenges in treatment. It effectively summarizes current treatment strategies and the role of surgery. 2. Multidisciplinary Approach: The emphasis on a multidisciplinary approach and personalized treatment strategies is well-articulated, underscoring the complexity of managing LP. 3. Inclusion of Recent Studies: The manuscript references recent studies and trials, such as the PRODIGY study and the use of DOS therapy, which adds relevance and timeliness to the discussion. 4. Clear Structure: The editorial is well-structured, with a logical flow from introduction to



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

conclusion, making it easy to follow. Areas for Improvement: 1. Standardized Definition: The manuscript mentions the lack of a standardized definition for LP. It would be beneficial to propose a more precise definition or criteria for diagnosis to aid in future research and treatment standardization. 2. Detailed Discussion on Controversies: While the manuscript acknowledges controversies in treatment strategies, a more detailed discussion on the specific points of contention and differing expert opinions would enhance the depth of analysis. 3. Patient Compliance and Quality of Life: The manuscript could benefit from a discussion on patient compliance with treatment regimens and the impact on quality of life, which are critical factors in treatment planning. 4. Future Research Directions: While the need for further research is mentioned, the manuscript could suggest specific areas or questions for future studies to address, providing a clearer roadmap for advancing LP treatment.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Experimental Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 96318

Title: Therapeutic Strategies and Prognostic Challenges in Linitis Plastica

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 08000720

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2024-05-03

Reviewer chosen by: Meng-Hua Liu (Quit 2024)

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-09-18 05:48

Reviewer performed review: 2024-09-23 08:06

Review time: 5 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" 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

This manuscript talks about advancing treatment strategies in Linitis Plastica (LP), particularly role of surgery, making a conclusion that LP requires a multidisciplinary approach and personalized treatment strategies tailored to each patient’s condition. However, there are some issues need to be addressed. 1.On page 2, the author mentions that ‘Non-curative resection may offer a potential enhancement in the prognosis of LP patients’. This seems to go against common sense and requires further explanation. 2.On page 6, the author talks about study by Xu et. Al, finding that NAC can enhance the prognosis of individuals with LP. While, the result seems to be beneficia, but not unbeneficial for the survival rate of LP patients. Please review carefully again. 3.The title focuses on the significance of surgery in LP, but the full text of surgery is less. Because the manuscript also discusses the research on neoadjuvant therapy, adjuvant therapy, etc., the title should be revised. 4.LP should be presented in more details, and recent advances in disease understanding should be included. 5.While surgery remains the mainstay of treatment, the role of adjuvant chemotherapy and postoperative radiotherapy is still under debate. The authors introduce many relevant studies, but do



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

not explain the reasons for the large differences between different studies. Perhaps, by comparing the differences between different studies, more population-specific conclusions can be drawn. 6. There is not enough information in the manuscript to support the research conclusions. It is suggested that more relevant studies should be added to further explain the latest progress in the field of LP, especially in the field of surgery. 7. There are many inconsistencies in the manuscript, please check the original research carefully, or change the presentation to make it consistent. 8. Some references are missing information, the author is requested to adjust the format of the reference according to the target journal, so that it meets the requirements.