



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2102

Title: CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1 and NQO1 polymorphisms and colorectal adenomas: The Self Defense Forces Study

Reviewer code: 02459305

Science editor: x.x.song@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-28 17:35

Date reviewed: 2013-02-17 10:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

The study subjects are so special that they were all male officials in the SelfDefense Forces. Despite smoking, they may have similar risk factors such like driking, food habits, etc. Although you have lifestyle questionnaire, I hope you give us more proof that other factors did not affect your final results.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2102

Title: CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1 and NQO1 polymorphisms and colorectal adenomas: The Self Defense Forces Study

Reviewer code: 02459573

Science editor: x.x.song@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-28 17:35

Date reviewed: 2013-02-19 05:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Thank you for the opportunity to read this most interesting article on the associations between the CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1, and NQO1 polymorphisms and colorectal adenomas risk. The Abstract, Introduction, and Methods are nicely written, but the Results section is currently quite problematic in terms of how it is written and how findings are presented both in the text as well as tabularly. As such, I recommend major revision. ABSTRACT ? “Polyp” and “odds ratio” should be pluralized ? The first sentence of “RESULTS” should be changed to “None of the five polymorphisms showed a measurable univariate association with...” ? In the RESULTS, the authors should avoid comparing increases and decreases in ORs in statistical terms (i.e., the odds ratio increased or decreased) and should rather rewrite focusing on the practical importance of these relationships (e.g., the odds of X increased twofold if Y). ? In the CONCLUSION, what is “wild type” ? ? In the CONCLUSION, that the sample was composed of Japanese men should be mentioned in the METHODS if it is going to be mentioned here. INTRODUCTION ? Please standardize throughout the manuscript whether genotypes/polymorphisms will be italicized or not. ? Generally, the INTRODUCTION is well written and has a nice flow. Perhaps a bit more on the originality of the study’s contribution would be nice. METHODS ?



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

Please explain what Self Defense Forces are? ? Pluralize “polyp” ? Specify that all participants were Japanese in ethnic heritage. ? In second paragraph of SUBJECTS, please add percentages to N values where appropriate ? We were unclear what “cigarette-years” meant (cigarettes per year) ? Please explain how BMI and alcohol use categories were established ? Please explain how hospital (a categorical variable) was controlled for in analyses RESULTS ? Need to report standard deviations wherever there are means ? The first paragraph of the results is very difficult to read and understand. An odds ratio of 2.11 would not typically be described as a very “strong” association. ? Not singly, but univariately ? There is no flow in this section, and the results are not discussed in a clear manner that mirrors the clarify of the METHODS ? Why when some significant findings are discussed are odds ratios and confidence intervals provided but then otherwise not? REFERENCES ? Please be aware that there are several references where the journal title is NOT italicized (e.g., CA Cancer J Clin and Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev) ? It would be helpful for interested readers to have DOIs reported for all and not just selected studies. TABLES ? It needs to be made clear in all titles, that was is being presented are the results of investigations into THE ASSOCIATION between genotypes and adenomas, rather than simply saying “genotypes and adenomas” ? Please define “referent” throughout ? Be careful of using two long hyphens in a row rather than one ? In Tables 2 and 4, the first two columns are difficult for the reader to understand. If they were perhaps labeled with different subheadings (e.g., Genotype 1, Genotype 2), this may be helpful. ? Look at the footnotes of all tables. The font size gets larger and then smaller again.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2102

Title: CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1 and NQO1 polymorphisms and colorectal adenomas: The Self Defense Forces Study

Reviewer code: 02454589

Science editor: x.x.song@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-28 17:35

Date reviewed: 2013-02-26 16:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

I carefully read this manuscript, and found that it was interesting and well written. I have no other comment.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2102

Title: CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1 and NQO1 polymorphisms and colorectal adenomas: The Self Defense Forces Study

Reviewer code: 02493079

Science editor: x.x.song@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-28 17:35

Date reviewed: 2013-02-26 18:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

1. What is the connecting link among CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1 and NQO1 besides the fact that they have been reported? What was your hypothesis that they would be associated with men? 2. From the introduction, it appears that you chose the SNPs in each gene based on prior literature. You should state your SNP selection criteria. 3. Please show HWE value for each SNP. 4. Authors claimed that " A nearly significant interaction was observed for the combination of CYP1A1*2C and NQO1 (P = 0.051). " But, four SNPs were tested. Thus, Bonferroni correction is needed to be performed for this association. 5. In terms of sample size, this study was conducted in 455patients which is middle number. Please provide the power of a statistical test in the manuscript. This may improve the quality of this study. 6. Discussion is not up-to-date.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2102

Title: CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1 and NQO1 polymorphisms and colorectal adenomas: The Self Defense Forces Study

Reviewer code: 02472140

Science editor: x.x.song@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-28 17:35

Date reviewed: 2013-02-28 07:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A (Excellent)	[] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[] Grade B: minor language polishing	[] Existed	[] High priority for publication
[] Grade C (Good)	[Y] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[] No records	[] Rejection
[] Grade D (Fair)	[] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[] Minor revision
[] Grade E (Poor)		[] Existed	[Y] Major revision
		[] No records	

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

- A regular Table 1 is missing from this manuscript. Such table usually reports sample characteristics by case-control status. It is important to include this table. - The authors should explain why the mean age in both groups was 52.4 years. Were the observations age-matched, or was it just a coincidence? - The odds ratios (and CI's) reported in paragraph 1 of the results section are out of place! Report association of polymorphisms first (main effects)- adjusted or/and unadjusted - before you assess the interaction effect of smoking. - Check epidemiological journals on the standard way to report results of logistic regression - usually one reports odds ratios of categories relative to some reference. - Results on Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium tests should come immediately after Table 1 (sample characteristics) results are reported - not after reported association results. - Persistent use of the word 'prevalence' is problematic. Remember, this is case-control study and not a cross-sectional study. - On page 8 last paragraph, instead of using the term 'nearly,' use the term 'borderline.' - Instead of using the term "measurable" association, use "significant" association. - On page 8, second last paragraph, last line, 2 cases were excluded! Why? Was it to make sure that the polymorphisms were in complete linkage disequilibrium? This should be explained. - In general, the results section needs to be re-written to reflect standard reporting of logistic regression results in case-control studies.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2102

Title: CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1 and NQO1 polymorphisms and colorectal adenomas: The Self Defense Forces Study

Reviewer code: 00186451

Science editor: x.x.song@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-28 17:35

Date reviewed: 2013-03-05 16:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Manuscript NO: 2102, Hamachi T et al., " CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1 and NQO1 polymorphisms and colorectal adenomas: The Self Defense Forces Study " In this manuscript, the authors examined the associations of the CYP1A1, GSTM1, GSTT1 and NQO1 polymorphisms with colorectal adenomas in Japanese men, including 455 cases and 1,052 controls. Based on their results, the authors concluded that the combination of CYP1A1*2C and NQO1 609CC genotype (wild type) was associated with a decreased risk of colorectal adenomas regardless of smoking status in Japanese men. The paper deserves publication if some necessary corrections are made. 1) The roles of these polymorphisms in genes have not been shown in this manuscript.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

The authors should mention that point in Discussion and should try to clarify the genetic effects and their function to colorectal cancer. 2) To ensure optimal presentation of your studies, please make sure that you have your paper edited by a native English speaker or otherwise by a professional editing agency, if you have not already done so.