



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 107029

Title: Evaluating log odds of positive lymph nodes as a prognostic tool in differentiated gastric cancer: A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 08490224

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2025-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: Shang Wu

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-03-21 07:50

Reviewer performed review: 2025-03-21 14:48

Review time: 6 Hours

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



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

Do authors omit important references? **No**

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

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

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

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

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

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

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

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**



Scientific quality	Grade A (Excellent)
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 for submitting your manuscript on the retrospective study evaluating the LODDS as a prognostic tool in differentiated gastric cancer. The study is well-designed, has a large sample size, employs appropriate statistical methods to compare LODDS with other lymph node staging systems (such as pN, NPLN, NTLN, LNR), and develops a LODDS-based predictive model, which has high prognostic value for moderately to poorly differentiated gastric cancer. Here are my specific comments and suggestions: 1. (Line 269-270) The results mention that the 5-year AUC of the model reached 0.722, but the AUC in Figure 4C is 0.710. Please carefully check where the discrepancy arises. 2. I



**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

have reviewed other articles on the prognosis of LODDS (especially regarding gastric cancer), and their sample sizes are indeed smaller than this study, which is an advantage of this research. However, in the final model comparison, besides pTNM staging, I would like to see whether this model has higher prognostic value compared to other indicators (such as biomarkers and the number of lymph nodes), which could be shown in the ROC plot. 3. Why are the corresponding patient numbers at the time points missing below the K-M in Figure 4D? I saw that Figure 1 displayed this information. Was it omitted for aesthetic reasons (hahaha)? I suggest adding it back for clarity. 4. I recommend including ROC curve graphs for 1, 3, and 5 years, as you have already presented the results for 1, 3, and 5 years in the previous nomogram and calibration curves. Having only the 5-year ROC feels a bit lacking (if necessary, it can be included in the supplementary file). 5. (Lines 250-260) The correlation between LODDS and tumor markers (CEA, CA19-9, CA72-4, CA125, CA242) mentioned in the results is very interesting. I suggest discussing the potential for future research to further explore whether these markers can provide additional prognostic information in the Discussion. 6. Finally, because of the rapid development of machine learning and its integration with medicine, more potential medical models are being proposed and applied. This may be a reason why the AUC of this study's model is only 0.7 despite the large data volume. I recommend adding some discussion on this possibility in the Discussion. In summary, this study systematically demonstrates the superiority of LODDS in prognostic prediction, especially in patients with moderately to poorly differentiated gastric cancer. This provides new insights for clinical practice and helps to more accurately assess patients' prognostic risks. After minor revisions, it is suitable for publication. I apologize for any issues that may arise in my review report and wish the authors all the best in their future research.



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 107029

Title: Evaluating log odds of positive lymph nodes as a prognostic tool in differentiated gastric cancer: A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05408889

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: MD, PhD

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2025-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: Shang Wu

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-03-22 17:15

Reviewer performed review: 2025-03-22 18:10

Review time: 1 Hour

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



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? **No**

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? **No**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **No**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **No**

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? **Yes**

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

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

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **Yes**

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

Are additional experiments needed for the study? **Yes**

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 C (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

This retrospective study investigates the prognostic value of the log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS) in gastric cancer (GC) patients post-radical gastrectomy, with a focus on its utility across tumor differentiation levels. The authors analyzed a substantial cohort of 2,103 patients and compared LODDS against traditional lymph node metrics (pN, NPLN, NTLN, LNR), concluding that LODDS independently predicts overall survival (OS) in moderately to poorly differentiated GC and outperforms other metrics. A nomogram incorporating LODDS and other variables (age, CA125, CEA, tumor differentiation) was developed with a C-index of 0.703. The study's aim to refine GC



**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

prognostication is commendable, and the large sample size strengthens its findings. However, significant methodological flaws and presentation issues necessitate major revisions to substantiate the claims.

1. Multicollinearity in Cox Regression Analysis The inclusion of multiple lymph node metrics (NPLN, LNR, LODDS, pN) in the same multivariate Cox regression model (e.g., Table 3) raises serious concerns about multicollinearity. These variables are mathematically interdependent—LODDS and LNR, for instance, are both derived from NPLN and NTLN—rendering them non-independent predictors. This interdependence likely inflates standard errors, leading to unstable hazard ratios (HRs) and unreliable p-values. For example, LODDS2's HR of 2.348 ($P = 0.045$) contrasts with the non-significant pN ($N_{3a}+N_{3b}$) result ($P = 0.171$), which may reflect statistical artifacts rather than true prognostic differences. To address this: Calculate the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for each variable; a $VIF > 5$ or 10 indicates problematic multicollinearity. Reanalyze the data by testing each lymph node metric in separate models alongside uncorrelated covariates (e.g., age, tumor markers). Compare model fit using AIC or BIC to objectively assess LODDS's superiority. Without these corrections, the claim of LODDS as an independent predictor lacks statistical rigor, undermining the study's core conclusion.

2. Clarity of Key Terms and Abstract The manuscript's readability suffers from undefined terms such as "LODDS1" and "LODDS2" in the abstract and results, which may confuse readers unfamiliar with the metric's categorization. Additionally, the abstract lacks a clear statement of the study's purpose, key findings, and clinical relevance.

3. Presentation Consistency Minor inconsistencies detract from the manuscript's polish. For example, font sizes vary in Table 1 (e.g., "Vascular tumor thrombus" is smaller), and abbreviations like "NMGC" are undefined. I suggest standardizing formatting across tables and figures and defining all abbreviations at first use or in footnotes.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 107029

Title: Evaluating log odds of positive lymph nodes as a prognostic tool in differentiated gastric cancer: A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00069855

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: Chief Physician, MD, PhD, Professor, Researcher, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2025-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: Shang Wu

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-03-24 00:14

Reviewer performed review: 2025-04-02 19:36

Review time: 9 Days and 19 Hours

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



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

Are the Key Words complete? **Yes**

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? **Not Applicable**

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? **No**

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? **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?
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 A (Excellent)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade A (Excellent)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade A (Excellent)
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?	Yes
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	Yes
Conclusion	Accept
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors: Thanks for submitting your manuscript (Evaluating the LODDS as a prognostic tool in differentiated gastric cancer: a retrospective study) to World Journal of Gastroenterology for publishing. Your manuscript presents a retrospective study based on the data from 2,103 cases suffering gastric cancer (GC) patients who underwent radical gastrectomy at Zhejiang Cancer Hospital. All documents that required by the Journal including the supplementary materials are presented. The writing in the manuscript is fluent, and less grammar error is found. The study design, the selection for



**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

the subjects of study, and the methods used for the data statistical analysis are reasonable. Your data analysis showed that a higher LODDS score was significantly associated with an increased risk of metastasis and recurrence, poorly differentiated tumors, advanced cancer, mucinous gastric adenocarcinoma, nerve invasion, and vascular tumor thrombus, and LODDS was also positively correlated with the tumor markers such as CEA, CA19-9, CA72-4, CA125, and CA242. From the results, you get the conclusion that LODDS is a robust independent prognostic indicator in gastric cancer patients with different degrees of tumor differentiation, with a superior predictive performance compared with pN, NTLN, NPLN, and LNR systems. I can say that these findings may be useful in clinic for physicians to assess the prognosis of GC in patients. GC is common disease in clinic, and its diagnosis and treatment are not optimistic in current. The accurate diagnosis and assessment as well as new effective therapeutic methods are urgent needed. Exploring novel diagnostic index and systems and developing new therapeutic reagents for tumors are a challenging work for all of clinical and research workers. Your study may be significant in detecting the prognosis gastric tumors. By the way, it is necessary to check the manuscript thoroughly again. A few of words and punctuation marks need to be corrects. Such as, in line 50, rubust should be robust? Best Wishes!



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 107029

Title: Evaluating log odds of positive lymph nodes as a prognostic tool in differentiated gastric cancer: A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 08490224

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: Researcher

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2025-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: Yu Bai

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-04-29 04:30

Reviewer performed review: 2025-04-29 04:33

Review time: 1 Hour

<p>Content to be reviewed</p>	<p>Are additional experiments needed for the study? No</p> <p>Does the research scope comply with ethics? Yes</p> <p>Will the manuscript’s content be of interest to readers? Yes</p> <p>Is the manuscript’s text correct, concise, and clear? Yes</p> <p>Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? No</p> <p>Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Do authors omit important references? No</p>
--------------------------------------	--



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

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

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

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

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **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 quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Yes**

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

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

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

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

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

Are the Key Words complete? **Yes**

Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? **Yes**

Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? **Yes**

Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? **Yes**

Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? **Yes**

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



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

Scientific quality	Grade A (Excellent)
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?	Yes
Conclusion	Accept
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author did a good job of revision, I'm fine with it



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 107029

Title: Evaluating log odds of positive lymph nodes as a prognostic tool in differentiated gastric cancer: A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05408889

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: MD, PhD

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2025-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: Yu Bai

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-04-30 13:22

Reviewer performed review: 2025-04-30 13:33

Review time: 1 Hour

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



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? **No**

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**



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

Scientific quality	Grade C (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 C (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 have no more question.