BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
Manuscript NO: 34061
Title: Generation of glyceraldehyde-derived advanced glycation end-products (GA-AGEs) in pancreatic cancer cells and the potential of promote tumors
Reviewer's code: 00504150
Reviewer's country: Canada
Science editor: Yuan Qi
Date sent for review: 2017-04-10
Date reviewed: 2017-04-21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read with interest the manuscript entitled, "Generation of glyceraldehydes-derived advanced glycation end-products (GA-AGEs) in pancreatic cancer cells and the potential of extracellular GA-AGEs to promote tumors" by Takata and co-workers. The manuscript is well written, the study was conducted properly, and the conclusion is supported by the data presented. I have several minor comments that the authors should address in order to improve the quality of the manuscript. 1. On page 4 and page 15, the authors state that they can use the PANC-1 cell line for experiment without restriction for regarding academic investigation as a statement identifying the institutional and/or licensing committee for human pancreatic caner cell line, PANC-1. To this reviewer, it is totally not clear if this statement is needed. What is the purpose of this statement? 2. Page 7. "Confocal microscopy was performed" should be "Confocal microscopic examination was performed" or something like that. 3. Page 8. "Data were expressed as …" should be "Data are expressed as …".