

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19305

Title: Down-regulation of KIF1B mRNA in hepatocellular carcinoma tissues correlates with poor prognosis

Reviewer's code: 02993003

Reviewer's country: Argentina

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-03-17 10:09

Date reviewed: 2015-03-20 07:40

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input 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

Dear Song-Zhu Yang and co-authors, I would like to mention some comments regarding your manuscript. It is well written, presented and the methods and results are good. However, I would suggest including some key points: 1-The conclusion of the abstract is very simple. Try to conclude with some future perspectives applying your findings in the clinical practice. 2-Methods: please define which clinicopathologic parameters were used. 3-The authors mention that the inclusion criteria were those patients with HCC confirmed during pathology who were treated in the Treated with what???? Surgery, transplantation, radio frequency ablation?? It is not clear. 4-How the initial HCC diagnosis was done? Imaging criteria? AASLD, EASL criteria? Please define this key point. 5-Which were the exclusion criteria. 6-Which HCC related stratification method (eg: HKLC or BCLC) was applied? 7-Did tumor invasion was diagnosed during imaging or only during pathologic analysis? Tumor vein invasion: macrovascular or microvascular invasion? 8-What about tumor grade or nuclear grade, Edmonson steiner grading system, and microvascular invasion??? Did KIF1B expression correlated with serum AFP?? 9-How the follow-up was assessed in all patients. The

authors did not clearly describe this key point because tumor recurrence might be influenced by how the follow up and tumor recurrence assesment was performed. I cannot consider if this lead to a time bias. The author mention that the patients with tumor invasion and with low KIF1B expression had worst prognosis, but they did not clearly show at what time point the imaging follow up was performed in all patients. This was a retrospective analysis and I feel that the imaging assessment was not uniform in all the patients. Please clarify this. 10- The main finding is that those patients with low KIF1B expression had higher tumor invasion and worst survival and higher recurrence rate. However, does this finding add any new data? We already know that those patients with tumor inv are prone to develop recurrence and worst outcomes after liver resection. Indeed, liver resection in the US, european and latinamerican countries is not performed and it is consider BCLC stage C: sorafenib only. What are the main clinical messages and application of your findings? Minor comments: 1-Correct "Prognoses" for prognosis. Page 4. 2-"..but not significantly so." ??? What is this?

Page 8

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19305

Title: Down-regulation of KIF1B mRNA in hepatocellular carcinoma tissues correlates with poor prognosis

Reviewer's code: 02992416

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-03-17 10:09

Date reviewed: 2015-03-24 18:50

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this paper, the authors aimed at investigating the relationship between KIF1B expression and clinicopathologic parameters, and its prognostic value for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). There are some SPECIFIC CONCERNS worth being addressed to improve the quality of the manuscript: 1, The amount of HCC samples is too little to support the results. 2, If the author show the protein level of KIF1B in Figure 1, they should also show the mRNA levels of KIF1B. 3, The author did not define "up/down-regulated expression of ". We don't know how they grouped these patients.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19305

Title: Down-regulation of KIF1B mRNA in hepatocellular carcinoma tissues correlates with poor prognosis

Reviewer's code: 03262113

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-03-17 10:09

Date reviewed: 2015-03-24 22:01

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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear prof Shu-Guang Chen 1- The significance of your research in manipulating KIF1B expression in hcc might have therapeutic implication but your results can not conclude that KIF1B for the 1st time is a liver cancer suppressor gene and further studies on large scale must be recommended 2- The manuscript's presentation and readability is good but the abbreviations must be mentioned 3-discussion is not well organized because the results drawn not appropriately supported by the literature and your reasoned explanations must be provided 4- references are appropriate and up to date 5- tables and figures clearly present the major amount of information in clear manner Best regards,