



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17218

**Title:** Clinical features of second primary cancers arising in early gastric cancer patients after endoscopic resection

**Reviewer's code:** 00187937

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-26 11:49

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-26 14:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input 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

Dear Editor, This is well designed and correct statistical analysis performed study. I just want to remind to the authors to add the p value for genders in Table 1. Regards.



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17218

**Title:** Clinical features of second primary cancers arising in early gastric cancer patients after endoscopic resection

**Reviewer's code:** 00227589

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-26 11:49

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-13 11:15

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

The manuscript submitted by Kim et al. evaluates a set of gastric cancer patient data in regards to early and advanced stage gastric cancer and second primary cancer development incidence and location. The manuscript overall is well written and I recommend publication after careful consideration of the following points: - Language and diction should be corrected, especially the use of the word clinicopathological is unusual - I do not know what this means? - Clear definitions of abbreviations the first time they are mentioned in the text (SPCs was not explained, EGC is mentioned in multiple places, etc.) - How did the researcher determine that the SPC was indeed an independent second cancer that did not develop as a metastasis? Was any marker analysis done to see if dedifferentiated cells from the gastric epithelium were present in the second primary cancer? - The authors mention in their discussion that EGC and AGC may represent different stages of the same cancer - but that cannot be the case in the same patient from this data set, correct? This should be clarified - Figure 2 is obsolete since figure 3 contains a clear distinction between the tumor locations - the only non-solid tumor was of hematological origin