PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 74923

Title: Prognostic Significance of the Preoperative Hemoglobin to Albumin Ratio for the Short-term Survival of Gastric Cancer Patients who Underwent D two Radical Resection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06084530

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-12 02:03

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-21 03:48

Review time: 9 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

The authors constructed a prognostic nomogram model for the short-term survival of GC patients. The results showed the nomogram model can accurately predict the short-term survival of GC patients with D2 radical resection. However, several alterations in the manuscript would make it clearer and more suitable based on the logic for its audience. These modifications are included as below. 1. What was the rational of this time (January 2017 to January 2019) period for this study?   2. It was a single-arm study with no control group for comparison, and thus selection bias could not be ruled out"   3. I also suggest that the authors review their references, as many of them are outdated. Since the topic is widely discussed, there are certainly more recent references. 4.what are the limitations of the study and its findings?   5.What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript? What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next?   6.How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice?

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) [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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a good manuscript. The authors demosntred a important relationship between HAR and large size tumors, deep and advanced stage for short term survival. The nanogram is interesting too. In my opinion the manuscript must o aceptd.