



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 92500

**Title:** Survival outcomes in early-onset oesophageal adenocarcinoma patients: a systematic review and meta-analyses

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05630677

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-01-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ru Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-05-27 05:43

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-06-07 20:22

**Review time:** 11 Days and 14 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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**

- Consider starting the introduction with a brief statement about the significance of studying early-onset oesophageal adenocarcinoma (OAC) specifically, before discussing the broader epidemiological trends.
- While in methods it's mentioned that a protocol was composed using PRISMA guidelines, providing more detailed information about the protocol (such as registration number if registered, specific inclusion/exclusion criteria) is necessary.
- The search strategy can be more detailed. Mentioning specific keywords or MeSH terms used, as well as any Boolean operators or filters applied, is important.
- The process of data extraction and quality assessment can be presented better. For example, provide more details on the criteria used in the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale and how discrepancies between reviewers were resolved.
- When discussing the studies excluded after full-text review, provide more detail on the reasons for exclusion. A brief summary of the main reasons (wrong study population, irrelevant outcomes) could be helpful.
- In discussion, explain more the potential biological differences, variations in treatment approaches, or disparities in healthcare access that might explain why some studies report better outcomes for younger patients while others do not.