Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 7253
Title: An increased expression of TNF- α is associated with advanced colorectal cancer stages
Reviewer code: 02537137
Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan
Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 12:15
Date reviewed: 2013-12-19 14:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The paper concerns the assessment of the expression of TNF-α in colorectal cancer patients. Authors stated that high levels of TNF-α expression could be an independent diagnostic indicator of colorectal cancer, and targeting TNF-α might be a promising prognostic tool in clinical staging of CRC. Major comments: (1) I recommend shortening the manuscript significantly (especially Introduction and Materials and Methods) as well as the number of cited literature. (2) In the Abstract it is stated that "Multivariate analysis confirmed the presence of elevated TNF-α gene expression in cancer cells, which strongly correlated with tumor progression". In the body of the paper I did not find any data concerning multivariate analysis. "Tumor progression" is more advanced stage or tumor progression after the treatment? The latter data are not presented. (3) In the Discussion authors stated "We showed that increased TNF-α gene transcription and protein expression levels in late stages of tumor progression are associated with an increased tumor recurrence rate…". Again no data concerning tumor recurrence rate were found. (4) Figure 2 and Table 1 should be omitted and the data should be placed in the Results section. (5) When the groups are small it is better to use absolute numbers instead of percents.

Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 7253
Title: An increased expression of TNF- α is associated with advanced colorectal cancer stages
Reviewer code: 00069349
Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan
Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 12:15
Date reviewed: 2013-12-23 22:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The manuscript was well prepared, yet the following items should be considered for reversion. Majors： 1) In order to prove that "high levels of TNF-α expression could be an independent diagnostic indicator of colorectal cancer", it should be better to add 30 cases of early CRC or colorectal adenomas with dysplasia. 2) How about the other tumor biomarkers such as serum or tissue CEA and CA 19-9? What is the co-relationship between TNF-α and CEA? Minors: 1) As Tumor necrosis factor-α (TNF-α) is a pro-inflammatory cytokine, there might be some difference in the expression of TNF-α between sporadic and colitis associated cancer, therefore, patient family history, past history with or without colitis should be included in table 1 or in section Materials and Methods (Clinical Samples). 2) There were not any data to prove that "targeting TNF-α might be a promising prognostic tool in clinical staging of CRC", as the follow-up or survival data were not seen in the text.

Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 7253
Title: An increased expression of TNF- α is associated with advanced colorectal cancer stages
Reviewer code: 02533388
Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan
Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 12:15
Date reviewed: 2013-12-27 20:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[Y]Rejection
[Y] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors describe the levels of mRNA and protein expression of TNF-α in tumors and normal-adjacent colorectal tissue from 30 patients. It is well known through a number of previous studies that levels of TNF-α increase in different types of tumors, including those from colorectal tissues. In my opinion, the number of patients in early (I/II) and late (III/IV) stages are low (10 vs 20) to determine the association between TNF-α levels and colorectal cancer stages. Results are poorly described and should be in agreement with nomenclature used in Table and graphs. Data of relative expression levels of TNF in early vs late stage are duplicate in main text. Does Figure 2C correspond to normal tissue? If not, please amend text. (P9 L12). Discussion should be properly developed. Figure 1: it should be self-explanatory. Please define controls and number of samples per cancer stage. Figure 2: Legend is confused and should be rewritten for better understanding. Arrow of section E should consistent with the others (C and D) for better visualization. Figure 3 is not properly justified. Letters (A and B) should be properly located. Table 1. UICC should be included as footnote avoiding being repetitive. In clinical staging, % of III and IV stages is the sum of both and it should be reported as footnote. pN2 should be corrected. Minor issues: keyword like "tumor stages" is preferred instead of "real time polymerase chain reaction" or "immunohistochemistry".