Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] 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	[Y] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:
I do not have confidential comments to the editor.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:
The authors present an impressive and interesting analysis of the orientation of chromosomal microduplications. This field has not been thoroughly studied and additional work has the potential to lead to new and consequential findings. The manuscript is well written and comprehensible. I would like to address the following points for improvement: 1) I believe that fiber FISH is a very specialized method and generally not routinely available. This should be stated, or else refuted.   2) Please resolve these two diverse statements: - Text: mechanisms of microduplications, page 4: However, intra-chromosomal exchange only creates microdeletion and not microduplication.   - Text: standard FISH, page 5: Compared to such intra-chromosomal duplications,⋯   3) For clarity, please use uniform descriptions throughout: - Text: mechanisms of microduplications, page 4: (1) inter-chromosomal, (2) inter-chromatid, and (3) intra-chromosomal   - Figure legend 1: (1) inter-chromosomal exchange, (2) inter-chromatid exchange, and (3) intra-chromatid exchange.   - Figure 1: (1) inter-chromosomal (2) intra-chromosomal (3) intra-chromatid   4) A graph could be considered to assist fig. (3), due to the weak resolution (especially 3B).   5) What is the importance (or possible consequences) of the orientation of microduplications for the authors? Since non-allelic homologous recombination is not assumed as the mechanism for inverted microduplications, what may be the cause of this finding? Does a diagnostic or clinical advantage arise with the knowledge of micoduplication orientation? Are there other examples concerning the importance of microduplication orientation?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

Ms: 2906

Title: Fiber-FISH analyses as a diagnostic application for orientation of the microduplications

Reviewer code: 00503405

Science editor: s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-03-24 19:01

Date reviewed: 2013-03-28 16:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] 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	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

The manuscript is original, well presented and of great technical / clinical importance. The only confusing thing for me is that the manuscript runs under the category of "Filed of Vision", where commentaries are required about articles published other, high-ranked scientific journals, but this manuscript is not a commentary, but a short report. Otherwise, I suggest to accept it for publication.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

The manuscript is original, well presented and of great technical / clinical importance. The only confusing thing for me is that the manuscript runs under the category of "Filed of Vision", where commentaries are required about articles published other, high-ranked scientific journals, but this manuscript is not a commentary, but a short report. The figures/tables are clear and help the understanding of the text. The references are relevant and up-to-date. I suggest to accept it for publication.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

Ms: 2906

Title: Fiber-FISH analyses as a diagnostic application for orientation of the microduplications

Reviewer code: 00069966

Science editor: s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-03-24 19:01

Date reviewed: 2013-04-03 15:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] 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	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

This manuscript is acceptable for publication after after completion of ref.no.6,12

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

The manuscript "Fiber-FISH analysis as a diagnostic application for orientation of the microduplication" by Yamamoto T et al is acceptable for publication after carried out the completion of ref.no.6,12

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

Ms: 2906

Title: Fiber-FISH analyses as a diagnostic application for orientation of the microduplications

Reviewer code: 00053419

Science editor: s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-03-24 19:01

Date reviewed: 2013-04-10 17:39

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

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

Dear Editor, The manuscript is of interest and I recommend its publication. However some minor issues should be first considered by the authors. Sincerely

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Yamamoto et al have provided an interesting analysis of the application of fiber-FISH to asses the orientation of duplicated and triplicated segments of chromosomes. The manuscript is well written with updated references and figures supporting the topics dissected in the text. Following there are some minor issues to be considered by the authors: 1. The value of the method to help our understanding of the mechanisms underlying the chromosomal aberration is clear. However, Is the assessment of the orientation something that may benefit the management of patients? 2. The resolution of the figures should be improved, mainly for figure 3. 3. Refs 6 and 12 should be completed.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

Ms: 2906

Title: Fiber-FISH analyses as a diagnostic application for orientation of the microduplications

Reviewer code: 00506358

Science editor: s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-03-24 19:01

Date reviewed: 2013-04-10 23:55

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

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

Yamamoto T et al: Fiber-FISH As a diagnosis application for orientation the microduplication   The authors reported in this manuscript Fiber-FISH analyses as a diagnostic application for orientation of the microduplication.   The study reported in this manuscript is interesting in term of importance and has a potential application.   The results are straightforward and reveal some direct evidence of epigenetic regulation in pathogenesis of endometriosis. However, before the manuscript can be accepted for publication, several points have to be fixed. 1. The manuscript need re-organized in the way that follows common practice as Abstract, Introduction, Methods, results and discussion or combination of results and discussion.   2. Abstract should very precisely summarize the result and conclusion. For example: "fiber-FISH analysis has the potential to reveal them" could be better if changed to "Our data indicated that fiber-FISH analysis has the potential to reveal the orientation of duplicated and triplicated segments of chromosomes". 3. It is difficult to separate which segment of the manuscript belongs to introduction (Background).   Are these two segments "MECHANISM OF MICRODUPLICATIONS" and "STANDARD FISH" included as parts of Background?   4. METHODS OF FIBER-FISH: "DNA fiber specimens can be prepared after separating chromatin structures by surfactants. To perform fiber-FISH analysis, traditional Carnoy fixation can be used." What the statements "can be" mean?   Did authors use these procedures? If DNA fiber was prepared this way, it should be stated as so "DNA fiber specimens were prepared after separating chromatin structures by surfactants. To perform fiber-FISH analysis, traditional Carnoy fixation was used.   There are several time "can be" were used in the manuscript and should be revised.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Yamamoto T et al: Fiber-FISH As a diagnosis application for orientation the microduplication The authors reported in this manuscript Fiber-FISH analyses as a diagnostic application for orientation of the microduplication. The study reported in this manuscript is interesting in term of importance and has a potential application. The results are straightforward and reveal some direct evidence of epigenetic regulation in pathogenesis of endometriosis. However, before the manuscript can be accepted for publication, several points have to be fixed. 1. The manuscript need re-organized in the way that follows common practice as Abstract, Introduction, Methods, results and discussion or combination of results and discussion. 2. Abstract should very precisely summarize the result and conclusion. For example: "fiber-FISH analysis has the potential to reveal them" could be better if changed to "Our data indicated that fiber-FISH analysis has the potential to reveal the orientation of duplicated and triplicated segments of chromosomes". 3. It is difficult to separate which segment of the manuscript belongs to introduction (Background). Are these two segments "MECHANISM OF MICRODUPLICATIONS" and "STANDARD FISH" included as parts of Background? 4. METHODS OF FIBER-FISH: "DNA fiber specimens can be prepared after separating chromatin structures by surfactants. To perform fiber-FISH analysis, traditional Carnoy fixation can be used." What the statements "can be" mean? Did authors use these procedures? If DNA fiber was prepared this way, it should be stated as so "DNA fiber specimens were prepared after separating chromatin structures by surfactants. To perform fiber-FISH analysis, traditional Carnoy fixation was used. There are several time "can be" were used in the manuscript and should be revised.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

Ms: 2906

Title: Fiber-FISH analyses as a diagnostic application for orientation of the microduplications

Reviewer code: 00505755

Science editor: s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-03-24 19:01

Date reviewed: 2013-04-17 13:23

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	[Y] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

please find the attachment.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

please find the attachment.