

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30730

Title: How to manage Gastrointestinal stromal tumor?

Reviewer's code: 02913875

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-15 22:50

Date reviewed: 2016-11-21 09:09

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor | | <input type="checkbox"/> [] No | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> [] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is well organized and written. 1. There are several errors of spacing of the words and misspelling. (epithelioid, characteristics, verylow, SUV.Liver, atleast) 2. I can't understand this sentence; They concluded that LWR can be safely performed and they have better outcome in terms of postoperative recovery regardless of tumor size and location [54]. You mean in terms of?

Authors' response:

1) epithelioid, characteristics, very low, standardized uptake value (SUV), liver, at least were corrected and spaced properly.

2) Thanks for pointing out the mistake we made. You are correct. We meant, "in terms of". Lee et al. did a case control study and they examined the efficacy and safety of LWR in comparison to open wedge resection (OWR) based on tumor size and location. The authors concluded that LWR can be safely performed and have better outcome in terms of postoperative recovery regardless of tumor size and location.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30730

Title: How to manage Gastrointestinal stromal tumor?

Reviewer's code: 02941552

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-15 22:50

Date reviewed: 2016-11-28 12:22

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article about GIST management. I think it is a well written paper but there are some spacing errors in sentences.

Authors response: All spacing errors have been corrected

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30730

Title: How to manage Gastrointestinal stromal tumor?

Reviewer's code: 03666824

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-15 22:50

Date reviewed: 2016-12-02 23:11

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper reviewed the GIST from its pathogenesis to diagnosis and management. The paper is well organized and written. But it is necessary to present pathogenesis clearly through some figures. And some spacing errors need to be evaded.

Authors response: All spacing errors are corrected.

Pathogenesis (figure 1)

