PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38483

Title: Establishment, functional and genetic characterization of a colon derived large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma cell line

Reviewer's code: 00008633

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-03-03

Date reviewed: 2018-03-18

Review time: 15 Days

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[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is important to establish good NEC cell line. Major comments 1. The authors must clarify definition of the name of HROC57. Is it the name of cell line or resected tissue or both ? What is HROC57 B cell line ? 2. The authors must explain why they selected

HCT116, which is adenocarcinoma but not NEC, as control in Figure 1 ? 3. They should show results of CD26, CD29, CD73, and CD166 in Figure 2. 4. Although they wrote results of immunohistochemistry only in Table 1, they must show those pictures in Figure. 5. Discussion is too much long. They should shorten this section. 6. They wrote "Actual chemotherapeutic regimen for the treatment of advanced NEC consists of a combination of etoposide and cisplatin but results are very poor" in the first paragraph of Discussion. However, they wrote "HROC57 showed a high sensitivity towards etoposide and cisplatin with a distinct increase of sensitivity after combination of cisplatin and etoposide (Figure 4)".   Thus, this cell line might not reflect the nature of NEC.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No