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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 39599

Title: Interconversion of two commonly used performance tools (Karnofsky Performance Status scale and Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group scale): an analysis of 5844 paired assessments in 1501 lung cancer patients

Reviewer's code: 02527528

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-05-03

Date reviewed: 2018-05-04

Review time: 10 Hours

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[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Such a study could be more practicable. One or more typical case could be provided for the reader to know and understand the two scales. 2 As the authors said, there is a

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

controversy. The advantages and the disadvantages of the two scales could be introduced. 3 Typical cases could be demonstrated to show which scale is better for clinical use. 4 Typo- and grammatical errors exist. For example, the phrase "and hence" should be preceded by a comma.

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

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 39599

Title: Interconversion of two commonly used performance tools (Karnofsky Performance Status scale and Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group scale): an analysis of 5844 paired assessments in 1501 lung cancer patients

Reviewer's code: 03428837

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-05-03

Date reviewed: 2018-05-07

Review time: 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] 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	[Y] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript about the correlation between KPS and ECOG PS in a large cohort from a lung cancer patients database. The authors suggest that the KPS

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

categories 10-40, 50-60, 70, 80-90, 100 are equivalent to ECOG PS categories of 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0 respectively, in the South Asian population. First of all, I would like to thank to the authors for their work. Possible corrections on the mentioned issues will provide a better understanding. 1. In Methods, it must be specified if the manuscript obtained the approval of the ethical committee. 2. The Discussion is too short. Factors that might explain the differences in PS scores given by different health care professionals should be discussed. The variation of inter-rater reliability of PS scores also lacks a clear consensus in the literature and so it should be discussed. I would like the authors to discuss what is the utility in clinical practice of their results 3. In Conclusions the authors should include the usefulness of the results of their study. 4.The reference numbers should be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence 5. The References should be up-dated. 6. Add one more keyword

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

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 39599

Title: Interconversion of two commonly used performance tools (Karnofsky Performance Status scale and Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group scale): an analysis of 5844 paired assessments in 1501 lung cancer patients

Reviewer's code: 02462179

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-05-03

Date reviewed: 2018-05-15

Review time: 11 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	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this present study, the authors analyzed the largest set of paired KPS-ECOG assessments in a cohort of lung cancer patients. They suggest that the KPS categories

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

10-40, 50-60, 70, 80-90, 100 were equivalent to ECOG PS categories of 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0 respectively. Even though the topic of this study was the interconversion of KPS and ECOG assessments, the common and specific characteristics, the strengths and weakness of them need be demonstrated clearly.

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