



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 108576

**Title:** Artificial intelligence powered radiomics model for the assessment of colorectal tumor immune microenvironment

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 08590098

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree and professional title:** MD

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Grenada

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2025-04-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Editor

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-04-18 07:13

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-04-20 03:55

**Review time:** 1 Day and 20 Hours

<b>Content to be reviewed</b>	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? <b>Yes</b> Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? <b>No</b> Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? <b>Yes</b> Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? <b>Yes</b> Are the Key Words complete? <b>Yes</b>
-------------------------------	--



# 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

Is the content of the Introduction adequate? **Not Applicable**

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete? **Not Applicable**

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Not Applicable**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Not Applicable**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **Not Applicable**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Not Applicable**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **Yes**

Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**



	Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? <b>Yes</b> Are additional experiments needed for the study? <b>No</b> Does the research scope comply with ethics? <b>Not Applicable</b>
Scientific quality	Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Language quality	Grade B (Very good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Minor revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Your Letter to the Editor presents a thoughtful and relevant discussion of the topic and raises several important points. Below are a few suggestions aimed at improving the clarity, accuracy, and scientific rigor of your letter: 1. Abbreviations: Please ensure all abbreviations are defined upon first use. For example, "ROC" should



**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

be introduced as “Receiver Operator Characteristic (ROC) curve.” The same applies to terms such as DCA and TIME. 2. Epidemiology and Risk Factors: • Minor edits are recommended when discussing risk factors for colorectal cancer (CRC). • If Lynch syndrome is discussed, consider briefly mentioning other relevant hereditary syndromes, such as Hereditary Nonpolyposis Colorectal Cancer (HNPCC), for completeness. 3. Clarity of Language: • The sentence “Tobacco use is linked to colorectal cancer incidence, while alcohol consumption increases risk and mortality; ethanol consumption at least 50 g/day increases risk” could benefit from revision. A clearer version might read: “Tobacco use is associated with an increased incidence of colorectal cancer, while alcohol consumption—particularly ethanol intake of 50 grams or more per day—is linked to both a higher risk and greater mortality.” 4. Study Design Considerations: • You provide strong recommendations regarding inclusion and exclusion criteria—particularly excluding patients with prior immunotherapy and emphasizing the need for radiologic or clinopathological diagnosis. • However, the term “older” is vague; please define the age threshold intended. • Additionally, the potential advantages of a prospective design (versus the retrospective model employed in the referenced study) should be briefly addressed. 5. Citations and Terminology: • When discussing the immunological role of CD4+ and CD8+ T-cells in tumor environments, a supporting citation would strengthen the point. The discussion on tumor-associated macrophages (TAMs) is well-constructed. 6. Word Choice and Style: • Certain word choices, such as “besides” and “further”, may be better replaced with more formal alternatives like “in addition” or “furthermore.” 7. Conclusion: • The phrase “single-centric nature” may not be immediately clear to readers. Consider using “single-centre design” or “lack of multi-centre data” for clarity. Overall, this is a well-structured letter that addresses key points of interest. With minor linguistic and structural refinements, the letter will offer even greater clarity and impact.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 108576

**Title:** Artificial intelligence powered radiomics model for the assessment of colorectal tumor immune microenvironment

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 08538114

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree and professional title:** MD

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2025-04-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Editor

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-04-19 00:09

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-04-22 01:55

**Review time:** 3 Days and 1 Hour

<b>Content to be reviewed</b>	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? <b>Yes</b> Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? <b>No</b> Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? <b>Yes</b> Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? <b>Yes</b> Are the Key Words complete? <b>Yes</b>
-------------------------------	--



# 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

Is the content of the Introduction adequate? **Yes**

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?  
**Yes**

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Yes**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Yes**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Yes**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Yes**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Yes**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **Yes**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Yes**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **No**

Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**

Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers?  
**Yes**

Are additional experiments needed for the study? **No**

Does the research scope comply with ethics? **Yes**



Scientific quality	Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade A (Excellent)
Language quality	Grade A (Excellent)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Minor revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this valuable Letter to the Editor. Overall, I believe this letter presents a thoughtful, constructive, and academically sound discussion of a timely and important topic in the field of oncology. The authors have raised pertinent and relevant points concerning colorectal cancer. This approach is highly relevant, as precision medicine and personalized treatment strategies have become key aspects of modern cancer care. I commend the authors for contributing to this evolving area of research, which holds promise for improving patient outcomes and treatment planning. That said, I would like to offer several suggestions to further



**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

improve the clarity, accessibility, and scientific rigor of the submission. First, with regard to abbreviations, I noticed that several acronyms such as "DCA" (Decision Curve Analysis), "ROC" (Receiver Operating Characteristic), and "TIME" (Tumor Immune Microenvironment) are introduced without prior explanation. While these abbreviations are commonly used in the field, it would enhance the clarity of the letter to provide the full terms at their first mention. This would ensure that the letter is more accessible, particularly for readers who may not be as familiar with these specific concepts. Furthermore, expanding these terms at their initial use would contribute to the professional presentation of the work, making it easier for a broader audience to follow the discussion. Secondly, I found the authors' recommendations regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria for future studies to be highly appropriate. In particular, the suggestion to exclude patients with a history of other malignancies within the past five years is a well-reasoned recommendation, as this aligns with common practice in many clinical trials. However, it would be beneficial to briefly expand on why this specific timeframe is often employed. For example, it could be mentioned that excluding patients with other malignancies helps to mitigate potential confounding variables related to prior therapies or immune modulation, which could influence the study results. If relevant, citing existing literature or referencing the fact that many trial protocols adopt this timeframe could further strengthen the argument and add credibility to the recommendation. In conclusion, this is a well-structured and meaningful letter that contributes thoughtfully to the ongoing discourse on colorectal cancer . I believe that incorporating the suggestions above would further enhance the impact and scientific value of the letter for the journal's readership, making it even more informative and insightful for those working in this rapidly evolving field.



**RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 108576

**Title:** Artificial intelligence powered radiomics model for the assessment of colorectal tumor immune microenvironment

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 08590098

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree and professional title:** MD

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Grenada

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2025-04-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ming Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-05-22 19:40

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-05-22 20:18

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Content to be reviewed</b>	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? <b>Yes</b> Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? <b>Yes</b> Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? <b>Yes</b> Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? <b>Yes</b> Are the Key Words complete? <b>Yes</b>
-------------------------------	---



# 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

Is the content of the Introduction adequate? **Not Applicable**

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete? **Not Applicable**

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Yes**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Not Applicable**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Not Applicable**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **Not Applicable**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Not Applicable**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Not Applicable**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Not Applicable**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **No**

Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**



	Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? <b>Yes</b> Are additional experiments needed for the study? <b>No</b> Does the research scope comply with ethics? <b>Not Applicable</b>
Scientific quality	Grade C (Good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Language quality	Grade B (Very good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Accept
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to commend the authors on their thoughtful and thorough revision of the manuscript. The revised version demonstrates a clear and deliberate effort to address all prior comments and recommendations, resulting in a scientifically and structurally sound submission that is now suitable for publication. The clarifications regarding terminology—specifically defining abbreviations such as ROC (Receiver Operator



**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

Curve), DCA, and TIME – have enhanced the manuscript’s clarity and accessibility for a broader readership. However, AUC (Area Under the Curve) needs to be defined for readers who may not be familiar with this abbreviation. The discussion of risk factors and the epidemiology of colorectal cancer (CRC) has also improved. The revised sentence regarding alcohol and tobacco use now reads with greater clarity and scientific accuracy. Additionally, the inclusion of other hereditary syndromes, including HNPCC, adds necessary depth to the section discussing Lynch syndrome. The methodology section has been strengthened by specifying inclusion and exclusion criteria with greater precision. While a retrospective model was used, the authors now provide an appropriate justification for its selection over a prospective approach. Overall, this revised manuscript has addressed all substantive and stylistic concerns raised during the initial review. It now presents as a clear, cohesive, and scientifically valuable contribution to the literature. I appreciate the authors’ responsiveness to the feedback and recommend the manuscript for publication without further revision.