

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18921

Title: MicroRNAs as diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 03062291

Reviewer's country: Russia

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-06 15:51

Date reviewed: 2015-08-05 18:20

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

The paper is heavily written and requires major improvement. First of all, not all miRNAs linked to CRC are described and the statement after each class (subclass) of miRs lacks any recommendations. I strongly suggest to place all mentioned miRNAs in a Table and define not only the references and some obvious facts (increased or decreased levels) but also give them a score of reliability - what can (should) be use as a prognostic marker. It is otherwise hard, especially for the clinicians, to figure out what they can rely on. Carefully proofread the manuscript. There are very many typos, misspellings and bad written sentences which makes this paper very hard to read. In particular (although not all) I found the following errors to correct: Page 1 "and more data suggest"; "ploYps" should be polyps; "X-ray test could bring about harmful radiation and isn't sensitive..." - rephrase and avoid any constructions to comply with scientific style; page 3 - "taken together, current methodologies .." - what about oncomarkers currently used for CRC diagnoses? page 3, 1st para "More, some...." can not write like this also - rephrase the last sentence Page 3, 1 sentence, 2d para - give the appropriate reference; space between CRC.Mir-21 decypher abbreviation for RECK Page 4 again, "ploYps will progress..." should be polyps; "to become to invasive" - > become too



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>

invasive; again! "ploYps, and is" should be polyps; CRC.MiR-21- spacing; the acronym FFPE stands for Formalin-Fixed, Paraffin-Embedded; qRT-PCR abbreviation already mentioned earlier; what is PDCD4?; in the next sentence pdcd4 is not capitalized - what is right? Page 5 the end of the first para should be rewritten the one before the last sentence, para 2 should be "has been made" para 3 "what's more,.." can not use constructions like that; Page 6 again... polypS; Page 7 qRT-PCR was already abbreviated oin page 4; "serum miR-29a" - please explain; Page 8 "with stage II disease,..." - rephrase; last sentence, 1st para DFS was already abbreviated on page 5; loci.MiR-29b - spacing ; Page 9 NOTCH1 and Notch - what is correct? Page 12 - what is HV? ccRCC - is it a right abbreviation? Page 14 BIC gene - please explain; page 15 CEA - decipher; Page 18 "miRNAs are both introduced, since..." re-write the sentence.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18921

Title: MicroRNAs as diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 00069471

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-06 15:51

Date reviewed: 2015-08-06 19:18

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

This is a well-written review article on miRNAs in CRC. If possible, the accuracy rate of miRNAs in diagnosing early CRCs might as well be described (of course, if possible to date).