

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3743

Title: Metabolomic studies on human gastric cancer: Review

Reviewer code: 00048752

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-05-20 12:42

Date reviewed: 2013-05-23 13:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> 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"/> Rejection
<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 an excellent review paper about metabolomic studies on human gastric cancer, focusing on the current status and further perspective of the biomarkers of gastric cancer, including detection, and prediction of prognosis, metastatic potential, and response to chemotherapy. The overall description is concise and clear, and references are up to date. #comments Atrophic gastritis are underlying condition of most of the gastric cancer. H.Pylori infection is another important factor leading to carcinogenesis in the stomach. I would suggest to include available data between metabolomic studies and these two factors, if possible.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3743

Title: Metabolomic studies on human gastric cancer: Review

Reviewer code: 00001114

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-05-20 12:42

Date reviewed: 2013-05-29 21:28

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"/> [Y] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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

This is a short review on metabolomics as a tool for biomarkers discovery in human gastric cancer. I understand this tool is promising but it has a lot of limitations. I would ask the author to take consider of limitations as it is now. I have the following comments – 1) The author cited the paper from Dr. Chen DC (#96), which said that serum amyloid A (SAA) was proposed as a diagnostic biomarker. Although it may be a sensitive marker as reported, but not a specific marker. SAA is a major, acute-phase protein synthesized in the liver as you know. As the authors mentioned, it is difficult to define a common metabolic profile characteristic for gastric cancer. I think that readers might be confused, judging from the composition of this paper. Please revise the structure of the paper. I think that should not include limitations in Summary and future directions. 2) P3, *Helicobacter pylori*(H.Pylori)? *Helicobacter pylori*(H.Pylori) Please write in italic type. 3) Please write “first NMR” in full spelling in Page 4, L14. 4) References are quite poor. There is a lot of luck of page number in References. For example, #5,33,35,37,39(incomplete), 40,77,85,100,102 Please check. 5) Other than those above, there are several typos, please check.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3743

Title: Metabolomic studies on human gastric cancer: Review

Reviewer code: 01803692

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-05-20 12:42

Date reviewed: 2013-06-01 07:58

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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review is well-written and clearly demonstrates the metabolomic approaches for gastric cancer. Please correct some spelling mistakes (for example, quadruple --> quadrupole).

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3743

Title: Metabolomic studies on human gastric cancer: Review

Reviewer code: 00504363

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-05-20 12:42

Date reviewed: 2013-06-05 16:23

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 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To be honest, as the metabolomic platforms are developing, metabolomics of human gastric cancer is a promising but quite challenging work. Although the authors have exerted big effort on summarizing and discussing reports related to this topic, most discussions remained superfic. I do not see what are the aims of the review paper, and what this review adds to the present knowledge, especially the challenges that hinder metabolomic discovery of gastric cancer. This manuscript is recommended to be rewritten and several major issues below have to be taken into serious consideration. 1. As far as I know, gastric cancer is one of malignancy with the lowest heritability. Development of gastric cancer is therefore regarded to be related more on environmental factors than genomic factors. This feature demands that metabolomic study on gastric cancer have to encompass metabolites as the result of the interaction of the host-symbiotic microbiome superorganism with its living environment. From this point of view, most reports related to this topic showed limitations. 2. Stomach is an important organ of the digestive tract. Its pathological and functional changes will greatly affect the nutritional state of human/animal. As an omic technique to systematic study the unique metabolic fingerprints, results from metabolomic studies of gastric cancer might become quite confusing because the metabolic perturbation derived from both the affected the nutritional state and gastric malignancy itself were presented. The authors have to take this point into serious consideration while summarizing and discussing reports related to this topic. 3. Common protocols of metabolomic platforms are widely available on academic or public web resources, such as wikipedia. Therefore, the authors have to address more details that are embedded into such kind of metabolomic protocols according to the distinct features of gastric cancer.