



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 47487

**Title:** Synchronous resection of esophageal cancer and other organ malignancies: A systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 00071054

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-16 11:43

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-19 23:56

**Review time:** 3 Days and 12 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1. Please explain the reason why patients with head and neck neoplasms were excluded from this study. It is well known that those were likely to develop concurrently with esophageal cancer and affect the extent of organ resection and lymph node



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

dissection and the type of reconstruction. 2. Patients who had concurrent neoplasms of the esophagus and the stomach were common in the clinical practice. Other type of reconstruction was reported in the following paper. Please confirm. "Kanda T. et al. Pedunculated gastric tube interposition in an esophageal cancer patient with prepyloric adenocarcinoma. World J Gastrointest Oncol 2011;3(5):75-8 [PMID: 21603033, DOI: 10.4251/wjgo.v3.i5.75]" 3. Intraoperative cryoablation for kidney neoplasm was not a surgical resection; therefore, should be excluded from this study. 4. Discussion was redundant and should be written more concisely. 5. Reference numbers were incorrectly given in several places. Please confirm.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 47487

**Title:** Synchronous resection of esophageal cancer and other organ malignancies: A systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 03259574

**Reviewer's country:** Algeria

**Science editor:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-17 20:28

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-23 13:49

**Review time:** 5 Days and 17 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors reported a systematic review on the synchronous resection of esophageal cancer and other concomitant organ malignancies regarding the safety, the feasibility and the oncologic results. The work is very interesting; however, some concerns have



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

been noted: 1-The abstract is less concise, less informative and less representative regarding the whole content of manuscript. 2- The objective of the study should be clearly reformulated in the abstract. 3- The introduction is too longer and the number of references is important (N=27), so , please ,shorten the introduction with decreasing the number of reference. 4-in Materials and Methods section: - Articles written in non - English language have been excluded from the study, regarding the reduced number of included studies in this work ( n=23)and patients (n=117) , including non-English papers may increase the number of both studies and patients . - The material and methods section should not contain any reference - explain what do you mean by peripheral gastrectomy in “( 2) Non-anatomic gastric resection refers to gastric preserving gastrectomy other than total/subtotal/peripheral/distal gastrectomy [28]” 6- The Results section should not contain any reference; the results are not well presented. 7-Discussion section: - The discussion is not well structured and some materials should not be in the end of discussion such as “Collectively, the data suggested that synchronous resection was safe, feasible and associated with low perioperative mortality (stomach: 4/81, lung: 1/18, pancreas: 0//6, colon/rectum: 0/2, kidney: 0/6, liver: 0/3), and as well as “Overall, our results support the safety and feasibility of synchronous esophagectomy and resection of other primary malignancies [59]”. - There are much redundant sentences. - The number of non-anatomic gastric resections were important (n= 53),probably,in order to use the remained stomach as graft for reconstruction. So more informations are needed regarding the oncologic results of patients. - Details on the preoperative therapies (chemo and radiotherapie ) for colorectal and gastric secondary neoplasm have not been provided . - Detailed informations are needed on the two-stage surgical procedure employed in some patients. - Regarding the several important limitations of the included studies in the present systematic review, it is so difficult to draw an accurate conclusion. Therefore



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

the final conclusion should be reformulated. 8-References - Some references should be formatted correctly - The following cited references "52,53,54,56,58,59" do not match well with the subject and the objectives of the study

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 47487

**Title:** Synchronous resection of esophageal cancer and other organ malignancies: A systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 02922607

**Reviewer's country:** Pakistan

**Science editor:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-19 04:13

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-28 12:35

**Review time:** 9 Days and 8 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The findings are original and important, quality is good, conclusions are appropriate and limitations are recognized by the authors.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

**INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No