

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38337

Title: IDO1/COX2 expression prediction for adverse prognosis in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 00057665

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-03-03

Date reviewed: 2018-03-03

Review time: 3 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

This is a retrospective analysis of a group of patients with colorectal cancer who underwent adjuvant treatment with and without celecoxib, in which cytoplasmic IDO1/COX2 co-expression was found to be an independent biomarker. I have the following questions and comments: 1. How was the sample size chosen? 2. How were patients with rectal tumors managed? Didn't they receive neoadjuvant therapy? 3. The TNM staging for colon and rectal tumors should not be aggregated. Results of rectal tumor staging should be provided. 4. Were all 62 survivors tumor-free at their last visit? 5. What was the follow-up protocol? 6. How many patients were not included in this study because of either tissue or follow-up data were missing?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38337

Title: IDO1/COX2 expression prediction for adverse prognosis in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 02992570

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-02-28

Date reviewed: 2018-03-05

Review time: 4 Days

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

Very interesting study. After some minor language revision, it can be published.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38337

Title: IDO1/COX2 expression prediction for adverse prognosis in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 03035546

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-02-28

Date reviewed: 2018-03-05

Review time: 4 Days

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

Overall, the manuscript is well written. Comments: 1 Results of rectal tumor staging should be provided. And the TNM staging for colon and rectal tumors should not be aggregated. 2 Some minor language polishing should be revised.