



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24384

Title: Predictive effects of bilirubin on response of colorectal cancer to irinotecan-based chemotherapy

Reviewer’s code: 03474649

Reviewer’s country: Turkey

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-01-21 17:49

Date reviewed: 2016-01-30 03:05

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input checked="" 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"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | 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

General comment: The authors investigated the role of bilirubin level and UGT1A1*28 polymorphism in irinotecan based chemotherapy response evaluation. In the abstract the authors calculated the “Cobil” value which is combining the TBil and UBil. In conclusion they stated that “CoBil, as a routine testing index in clinic, after validation, could be easily used to facilitate stratification of mCRC patients for individualized treatment options”. But in the result section they did not stratify the patients according to the CoBil value and did not define the “CoBil”. TBil and UBil values were only taken into account. On the other hand the auth?rs defined the CoBil at the Methods section. At the lastsentences of results in the abstract the authors stating that “Classifier’s performance of CoBil and UGT1A1*28 were comparable” but in the conclusion they only mentioned about the Cobil. This statement is confusing. Abstract should be rewritten briefly and more clear. At the results section under the subheading “4. Serum bilirubin levels and objective response”, Sentences which is beginning with “Based on combined TBil and UBil values (CoBil)” can be given in a separate table in order to be more clear which defines the CoBil. - In the introduction



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>

"Irinotecan-based therapy is one of the most important fundamental chemotherapy regimens for metastatic CRC (mCRC)." Sentences need references. Recently, in addition to irinotecan many drugs such as bevacizumab, regorafenib and ziv-aflibercept are recommended. After that sentences the authors pretty well described the pathophysiologic mechanism of irinotecan and study background. - The selection of the patients and methods used are correct. - At the "2. Clinical data collection" section "Cobil" used as "Cbil". Please use same abbreviations for consistency. - Using "Means and s.d.s" does not seem so good. Please prefer to using "means and SDs" in the text. -At the 3rd paragraph irinotecan should be corrected. -In the conclusion The authors emphasized the predictive effect of the bilirubin levels but in the conclusion of abstract they stated the benefits of Cobil. They did not mention CoBil in conclusion. - In discussion the authors described very brief results of previous studies and comment each of these investigations. Also compared their own results with other investigations. Finally they presented also limitations of their study. On the other hand, the discussion section should be more detailed. - In the last two sentences of discussion "in interventional clinical trials" should be replaced with "in international clinical trials"