

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 28544

Title: The impact of homeobox genes in GI cancer

Reviewer's code: 00111771

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-07-06 17:39

Date reviewed: 2016-07-15 19:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Great article very interesting well written well balanced it will certainly be of great interest for the journal readership

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 28544

Title: The impact of homeobox genes in GI cancer

Reviewer's code: 03647038

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-07-06 17:39

Date reviewed: 2016-07-20 21:26

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The strength of the manuscript is in the integration of the findings compiled from a large number of studies. However, the authors could expand their own interpretation of data, point out gaps in some of the work cited, and better explain the conflicting findings. The following suggestions are provided to improve the weaknesses pointed out above: 1) More critical assessment, not the summary, of the work cited is needed. Page 11, for instance: more discussion on how expression of HOXA13 is associated with advanced stage and poor prognosis? What mechanisms could account for this? Page 15, why do they think HOXB13 showed an opposite pattern? Could it be explained by post-translational modifications (Jung et al. 2005)? 2) Pages 5 and 12, the references cited given don't seem to be relevant to GI cancer. 3) Pages 11 and 16, statements are vague, and need more elaboration: what relationship and what clinicopathological parameters? Which studies demonstrate the significance to chemoresistance? 4) Pages 10-11, insight on conflicting findings are needed. 5) The Conclusion section lacks more detailed discussion on the limitations of current knowledge of the impact of homeobox genes in GI cancer. 6) In the abstract, the authors indicate that this review will summarize the available research on homeobox genes in regards to the diagnosis, treatment and



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>

prediction of prognosis in GI cancers. However, the clinical relevance is not addressed fully. Finally, I would suggest adding a figure showing key cellular processes involved in up and down regulation homeobox genes of GI cancers to give a quick picture of the findings in the field to date. This would be helpful considering the number of references cited in which epigenetic changes seem to be involved. While Table 2 is informative, it would be better to see which homeobox expression events are associated with the clinicopathology of the GI tumors: for instance: increased tumor grade or tumor aggression.