PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 76174

Title: Simple Practical Approach for the Histomolecular Diagnosis of CNS Gliomas based on 2021 World Health Organization Classification and European Association of Neuro-Oncology Guidelines

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03731081

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-05 16:44

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-06 14:30

Review time: 21 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The histomolecular classification of CNS neoplasms based on morphology is not modern. New classifications based on genetic criteria are needed. In modern classifications it is necessary to use known mutations (single nucleotide polymorphisms). The manuscript meets these requirements. This manuscript is recommended for publication.

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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, the theme of this article is attractive, but the structure of the article is not clear, which does not meet the "simple and practical" described by the author. It is suggested that the author refine and revise it for easy reading and understanding. In the context of "simple practical approach", figure 1 looks complex and inconvenient for clinical use.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 76174

Title: Simple Practical Approach for the Histomolecular Diagnosis of CNS Gliomas based on 2021 World Health Organization Classification and European Association of Neuro-Oncology Guidelines

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06090125

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Lecturer, Technical Editor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-02 14:22

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-04 07:02

Review time: 1 Day and 16 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

My Comments and Suggestions to Authors: 1- The abstract is not convincing and is disorganized, it should be refined to precisely illustrate what authors have done in this paper within 200 words.   2- In my opinion, the abstract is too cumbersome and is hard to catch the key point. The keywords need to be more detailed. 3- The contributions presented in this paper are not sufficient for possible publication in this journal. I highly suggest authors to clearly define the contributions. 4- The literature has to be strongly updated with some relevant and recent papers focused on the fields dealt with the manuscript. 5- There are no citations for many sentences in this manuscript. Why? Please check. 6- Many details are missing and others unclear. 7- The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Write your conclusions. 8- References aren't formatted according to rules. 9- The manuscript is hard to be understood and words should be improved. 11.   Finally, authors are suggested to revise and improve the quality of manuscript

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors' answers are correct. My assessment of the authors' responses to reviewers is very good. The manuscript is recommended for publication.