



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Immunology

Manuscript NO: 41895

Title: Cancer immunotherapy by targeting immune checkpoint receptors

Reviewer’s code: 00502947

Reviewer’s country: Australia

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-08-30

Date reviewed: 2018-09-08

Review time: 8 Days

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A very interesting and important review on the topic. Comments Is ‘Receptors’ in the title required? Page 4, line 16, spelling IL-2-dependent Page 5, lines 8-10; requires elaboration on findings, rather than just say altered. Page 5, lines 11-14; Do cancer cells perturb CTLA4 function or expression as to do with PD-1/PL-L1 pathway? Page 5, line



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

27: PD-1. This should be left after the description of the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway below
Page 6, line 26-29: Explain how this difference between the 2 subsets achieved Page 11,
line 9-12; Reference? What about Th17? Page 15, line 1-3; This gives an unnecessary
negative impression. Why is this an obstacle to the therapy? Perhaps a better word is
needed or rephrase the sentence

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No