

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 33517

Title: Predictive role of PD- assay in NSCLC patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors

Reviewer's code: 02445626

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-02-14

Date reviewed: 2017-03-05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Cancer immunotherapy is one of the areas in which major medical breakthroughs are being witnessed. The blockade of immune checkpoints is among the most promising immunotherapeutic approaches, but demonstrates limited clinical benefits, for cancer patients. Therefore, the mini-review article is of interest and targets the hot spot of present cancer research. Unfortunately, there are numerous mistakes of grammar and spelling in English. The use of wrong words, phrases or structures may mislead the readers. I have marked some of these points. However, the role of reviewers is not to provide editing service. I am unable to label every mistake. I strongly suggest that the authors should ask an English editing service to revise the whole manuscript and then re-submit it to the journal. Tables should be of three-line tables in academic publications.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 33517

Title: Predictive role of PD- assay in NSCLC patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors

Reviewer's code: 02446022

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-02-14

Date reviewed: 2017-03-12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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

Authors need to carefully revise the language, paying particular attention to spelling errors and editing leftovers. Just to mention some: "Ipilimumab" in the introduction, "discontinued" and "(opp. RRs were)" in section 2.1.1, "cut off value?" in section 2.2.1. Check carefully all abbreviations, and their occurrence. Introduction section. CTLA4 and PD1 are not expressed only on CD8+ T cells. Section 2.1.1. 4th line: "by a 5% expression threshold" is not needed since the scoring is described in the next sentence. Section 2.2.1. Does the results reported refer to the training or to the validation cohort of KEYNOTE-001 study? The sentence "; in patients with tumors, PD-L1 positivity ..." has to be rephrased. Section 3.1.1. Please rephrase "[95% CI: 6.7 was not reached] Section 4.1. "; score = 2 positivity between $\geq 5\%$ and $< 50\%$ " refers to both IC and tumor cells? Please spell out ITT. Section 4.3. End, "Median PFS was 11.6 weeks...". If data refers to Verschraegen's study, the authors reported mPFS in the table as NS. Section 4.2. "Overall ORR was 25% (11/43 PD-L1 positive; 1/8 PD-L1 negative)." Should be deleted



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>

as it does not add valuable information to the next sentence. Authors should combine Table 1 and 2; 3 and 4; 5 and 6, 7 and 8. Authors could comment on whether PD-L1 positivity on tumor vs. immune cells has a different effect on outcome/response to treatment and on the potential functional correlates, as well as on whether other molecules involved in the PD1/PD-L1 signaling axis are being or could be explored as predictive markers of response to these immunotherapies.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 33517

Title: Predictive role of PD- Y assay in NSCLC patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors

Reviewer's code: 00608223

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-03-12

Date reviewed: 2017-03-30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a timely review of a clinically important topic. The literature review and clinical context are both very good and clear. There are a few instances where the English phrasing could be better - for example 'On the contrary' is used quite a few times but it does not work in the context used - something like 'Conversely' would work better. Superimposable was a word used elsewhere in the article that does not make sense to me (native English speaker - in fact I did not know it was a word!) - in the context I read the word I think indistinguishable would be better. Whilst the tables were informative and I can see why the authors wished to present all data in the same way I would have valued a table summarising properties of the various assays at technical level, and use of some figures to give variety.