

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5566

Title: Cancer in Eastern Libya: Results from Benghazi Medical Center

Reviewer code: 02468686

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-09-16 11:34

Date reviewed: 2013-10-15 17:45

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you very much for your manuscript which i found really interesting. However, there are some issues which i list below that does not permit the publication of this work in its current form. Therefore, i strongly recommend the major revision of your work. Please find below my specific comments: 1. Title: the title could become more attractive to the reader 2. Abstract: this section could be improved. The discussion part of the abstract contains sentences that are unclear. This part should also state why is this study important and what makes this study worth publication. 3. Core tips: Is this part necessary? 4. Introduction: this part needs more development. 5 sentences for an introduction is not enough. Where is the aim of your study? It should be normally included in this part. 5. Methods: last sentence of the "Study population" is not clear. Why did you restrict data collection for 1 year? Did you collect information about SES and educational level? 6. Results: You could have described Table 3 and 4 more adequately. In addition, you have included some Results in the Discussion part of the manuscript which is not appropriate. 7. Discussion: This part normally starts with a paragraph which summarizes the main study's findings. I would like to see some explanation of some of your findings e.g. "While the overall incidence of colon cancer.....it was previously thought that the rate of malignancies in the eastern region was significantly higher." I would like to see some explanation of why is this study useful and important. Are there any implications for practice? You should convince the Editors and the reviewers that this study deserves publication. 8. Please add a conclusive paragraph. 9. Tables need some format e.g. include a row names as column age above the min, max, sd. I am not sure that you need all those Tables. English language improvement is recommended. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to read and comment on your manuscript.