

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6974

**Title:** Proteomic Identification of Tumor Biomarkers Associated with Primary Gallbladder Cancer

**Reviewer code:** 02519865

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-31 20:08

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-01 06:56

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	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 TO AUTHORS

This is quite novel finding about GB cancer using proteomic approach and authors found three biomarkers of the GB cancer. Although the method was very scientific and accurate, the limited patients number doubt the conclusion of this research. Further validation using more samples are warranted for future clinical use, and also functional validation will needed.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6974

**Title:** Proteomic Identification of Tumor Biomarkers Associated with Primary Gallbladder Cancer

**Reviewer code:** 00058419

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-31 20:08

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-19 03:58

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 TO AUTHORS

In their manuscript, Dr. Huang and colleagues used the proteomic approach to identify the potential biomarkers for human primary gallbladder cancer (PGC). The study was overall well designed and appropriately controlled. In particular, samples with cholecystitis were included in the initial 2D-gel profiling as “non-specific disease controls” and the protein candidates identified were further confirmed for their significance with multiple approaches including Western blotting, qRT-PCR and IHC in a separate set of 20 samples from patients with PGC. However, the study, as currently designed and executed, is likely to identify potential biomarkers for PGC, not the biomarkers for the cancer development and progress as stated by the authors in the manuscript (Aim). Moreover, I believe that the claim in Core Tip “the first comparative proteomic study to use human PGC, cholecystitis and normal gallbladder tissues” is overstated since a similar approach was employed by Tan and colleagues (Proteomic study of gallbladder cancer, with special reference on the expression and significance of annexin A3. *Zhonghua Bing Li Xue Za Zhi*. 2010 Jun;39(6):382-6). Those overstatements should be corrected to more accurately reflect the contribution of this important piece of work. It appears that the authors missed the above paper in which Tan et al. have identified annexin A3 as the potential biomarker for PGC using a similar approach. Therefore, it will be important for the authors to discuss the findings in this manuscript and those of Tan et al. Other minor points: Fig. 1 The marks for 7 proteins of interests were difficult to see in my copy of the manuscript.