



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Radiology*

**Manuscript NO:** 88646

**Title:** CT-based nomogram of Siewert type II/III adenocarcinoma of esophagogastric junction to predict response to docetaxel, oxaliplatin and S-1

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 00058381

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Austria

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-10-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-11-27 19:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-11-28 16:09

**Review time:** 20 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Comments/Suggestions: (1) This manuscript presents results of a rather small sample, but it may be seen as an incentive to further research. (2) The "Authors' Contributions" should be specified. (3) Please check Figure 1a-d and the corresponding Figure legends a-d; they are not consistent. (4) Abstract, Background: "a partial patients" -> a part of the patients. (5) Materials and Methods, Patients, third paragraph: "we did not enrolled..." -> we did not enroll... (6) Image-based Treatment Response Evaluation, first paragraph: "significant higher" -> significantly higher. (7) Image-based Treatment Response Evaluation, last sentence: "If a lesion was non-measuralbe..." -> If a lesion was non-measurable... (8) Results, first paragraph, last sentence: "Because of all ICC values greater than 0.9, the measurements from the first measurement of observe 1 were repeatable and would be used for subsequent analysis." - Please improve (rephrase) this statement. (9) Results, last paragraph, first sentence: "...the C-index of the model were 0.838..." -> ...the C-index of the model was 0.838... (10) Results, last paragraph, second sentence: "...was validated..." -> ...were validated... (11) Results, last paragraph, last sentence: "...performed well in two cohorts" -> ...performed well in the two cohorts. (12)



**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

Discussion, fourth paragraph: "AEGs with atrophy or intestinal metaplasia was less aggressive..." -> AEGs with atrophy or intestinal metaplasia were less aggressive...; "this histologic changes" -> these histologic changes; "prognosis of tumors with intestinal metaplasia was better than tumors without intestinal metaplasia" -> prognosis of tumors with intestinal metaplasia was better than of tumors without intestinal metaplasia. (13)  
Discussion, fifth paragraph: "By identifying non-responder..." -> By identifying non-responders... (14)  
Discussion, penultimate paragraph: "the general applicability of our models need further validation" -> the general applicability of our models needs further validation. (15)  
Discussion, first half of the last sentence: "with Siewert type II and II" -> with Siewert type II and III. (16)  
Discussion, second half of the last sentence: "identify non-responder" -> identify non-responders; "to adjust the treatment strategies to avoid toxicities associated with DOS" -> to adjust the treatment strategies and to avoid toxicities associated with DOS.