



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 103029

Title: Phase angle as a prognostic biomarker in metastatic colorectal cancer - a prospective trial

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 08349585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: Croatia

Manuscript submission date: 2024-11-05

Reviewer chosen by: Shang Wu

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-12-04 04:30

Reviewer performed review: 2024-12-12 08:56

Review time: 8 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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

I have carefully reviewed the manuscript titled "Phase angle as a prognostic biomarker in metastatic colorectal cancer - a prospective trial." The study addresses an important clinical question regarding the use of phase angle (PA) as a prognostic marker in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC) undergoing first-line chemotherapy. The manuscript is generally well-structured, and the research appears to be methodologically sound. 1. The study provides valuable insights into the role of PA as an objective pre-chemotherapy prognostic factor in mCRC. The findings that a high PA ($\geq 4.60^\circ$) is associated with longer median progression-free survival are novel and could have significant implications for patient stratification and treatment planning. 2. The prospective observational design strengthens the validity of the findings. However, the single-institution design may limit the generalizability of the results. It would be beneficial if the authors could discuss this limitation and its potential impact on the findings. 3. The use of ROC curve analysis to determine the PA cut-off value is appropriate. Nevertheless, the manuscript would be strengthened by additional sensitivity analyses to evaluate the robustness of this cut-off value. 4. The results indicate



**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

a significant difference in PFS between the high and low PA groups, but no difference in objective response rate (ORR). The authors should discuss potential reasons for this discrepancy and its clinical implications. 5. The discussion is comprehensive, but it could be enhanced by comparing the findings with other studies that have used different methodologies or populations. Additionally, the authors might consider discussing the potential mechanisms underlying the association between PA and survival outcomes. 6. Figure 2: The Kaplan-Meier curves are informative, but the number of patients at risk for each time point should be included in the figure or the figure caption for better clarity. 7. No specific details on the randomization process and allocation concealment were provided in the manuscript. This is a very important part of prospective trials to ensure the reliability of the results and reduce bias. 8. The manuscript utilized the Kaplan-Meier and Log-Rank tests, which are standard methods in survival analysis. However, the article did not mention whether corrections were made for possible confounding factors, such as age, gender, tumor stage, etc. In conclusion, the manuscript presents important findings that contribute to the field of oncology. With some revisions, particularly in addressing the generalizability and providing additional analyses, the study could be a valuable addition to the literature.