

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6942

Title: Strategies for early detection of resectable pancreatic cancer

Reviewer code: 00057544

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-11-01 11:52

Date reviewed: 2013-12-05 19:50

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

Major comments to the authors 1. It would be interesting to mention what the current criteria for "resectability" are in the first place, and how these are evaluated in clinical practice 2. A conclusion is missing regarding the diagnostic value of the discussed screening parameters 3. The article should be shortened and edited by a native english speaker Minor comments to the authors Chapter 1: Screening - Page 2: rather say "tumor resectability" than "disease resectability" - Page 4: typo: current smoker (not smokers) - Page 7: the second sentence is very hard to read, consider to rephrase - Page 8 ff.: in this section there is a lot of repetition, it could be shortened and structured more logically. In the last paragraph the word "have" is missing : "overall, it appears that nearly half of the patients who HAVE (or with) early stage resectable tumors also have diabetes. The following sentence is also grammatically incorrect. - Page 9 ff.: in this section there is some repetition and lack of logical structure, too. What is the consequence of the presented findings? - The next section is called "identify precancerous neoplasia", maybe "identification of precancerous lesions" would fit better. The same applies for the first sentence, which is grammatically incorrect as it stands. The whole section needs revision of language. Chapter 2: Biomarkers - Page 11 at the bottom: I don't agree that "biomarker screening is generally necessary to identify early lesions" - Page 13: what do you mean by 'subradiographic unresectable pancreatic cancer'? - I would try to reduce the number of subheadings in this section - Page 14: I don't understand the first sentence "attempt to improve the performance of CA19-9..." - Page 15: grammar of sentence 2 - Page 17: second paragraph: "with improvements IN (not 'to') the technology.." same mistake on page 20 Chapter 3: Imaging - Page 20: see above - Page 21: replace 'must' with 'be' in the last sentence of the first paragraph - The last sentence of the conclusion could be rephrased to be more comprehensible

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6942

Title: Strategies for early detection of resectable pancreatic cancer

Reviewer code: 02528478

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-11-01 11:52

Date reviewed: 2013-12-11 18:55

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 checked="" 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Okano et al, reviewed the strategy for screening high risk groups in the frame of pancreatic cancer. Although the review requires minor English revision, the manuscript is well written and can be of potential interest of WJG readers. Comments: The paragraph entitled "Other potential biomarkers" is too short. - Although the authors reviewed the potential biomarkers that are able to predict the pancreatic cancer onset, I suggest to add other biomarkers (hENT1, Mesothelin etc.etc...) which are able to predict the chemotherapy end point. - Paragraph: proteomic: The authors wrote that "The application of proteomics in studying pancreatic cancer is still in its early stage and remains challenging; however, as an emerging technology it has already provided fundamental information to improve the understanding of disease mechanism and potentially offer solutions for early detection of the cancer". The possible solutions are not mentioned by the authors. Please speculate about them.