

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 51569

Title: MiR-96-5p silence induces cell apoptosis in gastric adenocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 00717554

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Postdoc

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-19 16:54

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-19 17:11

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to mention the following comments: 1- Methods: first line: "level 3" needs



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

explanation. 2- Download date and time is missing. 3- There is no explanation about changing the numbers from 452 to 299. Based on which selective criteria (first line on results)? There is no such criteria in method section. 4- "... identified between GAC and normal control samples, including 225 upregulated and 74 downregulated miRNAs. .." The number of normal control sample was 42. It is not known if these figures belong to which group. 5- "A total of 20 GAC patients and 20 healthy subjects were included in this study. " What does it mean? There is no explanation in this regard in method section. Table 1 is for 40. Why 299 in abstract and results? Good Luck

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 51569

Title: MiR-96-5p silence induces cell apoptosis in gastric adenocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 02536349

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-19 15:19

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-19 17:47

Review time: 2 Hours

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 well designed and hypothesized study. 1 Title. The title reflects the main

subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. 2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. 3 Key words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4 Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study. 5 Methods. The manuscript describes the methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail. 6 Results. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. Silencing or activating of some miRNA's (miR-96-5p in this study) are widely under investigation and this study reports a novel pathway of Palmitoyl transferase using MGC-803 cells.. 7 Discussion. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. The figures are adequate. 9 Biostatistics. The manuscript meets the requirements of biostatistics. 10 Units. The manuscript meets the requirements of use of SI units. 11 References. The manuscript cited appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. There is no self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. The style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories. 14 Ethics statements. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics. 15 Recommendations: There are few errors that should be corrected before publishing. In statistics section > "mean \pm standard derivation" should be corrected as "deviation" Distal metastasis



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

should be “distant metastasis” Pvalue should be “p value” miRNA-96-5p also inhibits the proliferation, migration and epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT) of gastric cancer cell by down-regulation of FoxQ1 and few other (Casp..) pathways could be mentioned. Adjacent normal tissue should be detailed as distance in cm. 3-4 centimeters?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No