

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 42785

Title: KMT2D deficiency enhances the anti-cancer activity of 8H37 in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 03006775

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-10-23

Date reviewed: 2018-10-31

Review time: 2 Hours, 8 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the present work the cytotoxic effect of curcumine analog on different pancreatic cancer cells and its mechanism was investigated. The study use different methods with standard design to prove the hypothesis. However, some point should be clarified 1- The



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

full name of PDAC should be mention in the abstract. 2- epigenetic, genetic and drug resistance were not key words. KM2D should be added as keywords. 3- In the introduction section the authors must describe the background and present the status and importance of the work, but in the last 2 paragraphs the result of the study was present in detail. In this study we identified the role of L48H37 in anti-human pancreatic tumors. L48H37 promoted the apoptosis of tumor cells by activating..... we found no relationship between the level of KMT2D lowering and clinical features as well as prognosis. The last 2 paragraph must change. 4-In the cell viability assay section, why the authors use different concentrations of DMSO? What was the final concentration of DMSO in media? 5- Which equation was used for IC50 calculation?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 42785

Title: KMT2D deficiency enhances the anti-cancer activity of 8H37 in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 02982391

Reviewer's country: Saudi Arabia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-25

Review time: 5 Hours, 6 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

World Journal of Gastroenterology Basic Study Down-regulation of KMT2D promotes L48H37-induced apoptosis in pancreatic cancer Report Thank you for inviting me to review the above titled manuscript. The study addresses an important topic. However,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

there are problems in the manuscript that need to be addressed by the authors. 1. Abstract: The aim of the study: The statement "Its therapy-related factors" are these possible underlying mechanisms? Is the study in vivo or in vitro or a combination of both? 2. Abstract: Methods: It is not clear which component is in vitro or In vivo studies. Also whether you have used human cell line. The English language needs to be improved. For example, "we examined cells growth inhibition by using CCK8", could be changed to "we examined the effect of CCK8 on cell growth inhibition and ..". Also change to "using flow cytometry" instead of "by flow cytometry". Similar problems noted throughout the manuscript. 3. Abstract: The last 6 lines under methods are not clearly written and confusing. What are your aims? You may need to limit the study to what you stated in the title. 4. Abstract and results again state (clarify) which component was the in vitro and which part was in vivo study results. 5. Conclusion could be strengthened. 6. Key words: Did you study drug resistance and epigenesis in this study? I cannot see this. 7. Introduction: you need to add appropriate references. For example, third line, fifth line, and after the statement ending with "a trifle" 8. The authors are stating "inter-individual differences in drug reaction and thus precision medicine or personalised medicine has been proposed...." as a limitation for current therapy of pancreatic cancer, but you have not studied or tested this component in the current study. These statements should be omitted. 9. Again we need references after epigenetic abnormalities and after "and so on" . 10. The authors should amend the introduction and make it more focused to justify the needs for this study. It could also be shortened. Again, several statements are made on page 7 without appropriate references. The list of references does not reflect the current broad references in the literature check, PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science. You need to cite the proper references. State what was the problem, your research question and hypothesis. 11. Introduction: The statement of in clinical practice (last 4-5 lines) should be omitted. I cannot see clinical work here. 12.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

Material and methods: start with a sub title, "Study Design" to outline the experimental plan and how you designed these experiments to answer your research questions. 13. All subtitles under methods need appropriate references. I cannot see. Any references under methods. How can the readers know from where you came with these methods, and if other researchers would like to check on your work and follow these studies, they need to examine the references you have used. We need references from the broad literature. 14. The SIX links on page 15 could be changed to references. In these references add the link and state when was last accessed. Follow the journal guidelines. 15. Results: could be reduced and made more focused. Indicate which component is in vivo and in vitro. 16. Discussion: The authors are repeating the results again. This should not be the case. The authors need to rewrite the discussion and conclusion, and they should discuss their findings against other studies in the literature, identify the limitation of the study. The discussion should be reduced and focused. Rewrite the conclusion and strengthen it. 17. The English writing should be carefully reviewed. An agent in academic scientific writing could be asked to review the English. 18. The references are poorly selected. Please check PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science, and include appropriate references.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

[] The same title

[] Duplicate publication

[] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 42785

Title: KMT2D deficiency enhances the anti-cancer activity of 8H37 in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 03475120

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-26

Review time: 6 Hours, 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Each figure is busy. All figures involve a lot of images, and it is so difficult to see these data. All figures should be remade.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No