

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15884

**Title:** Cancer cachexia; its mechanism and treatment

**Reviewer's code:** 02445805

**Reviewer's country:** Croatia

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-25 16:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-12 00:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 "Cancer cachexia; its mechanism and treatment" by Tomoyoshi Aoyagi et al is a review article, which describes potential mechanisms underlying cachexia and current treatment options. The manuscript is in general well written and the cited literature is comprehensive and recent. There are some comments that should be addressed: 1. Some facts/sentences have been unnecessarily repeated several times (e.g. "...is responsible for the death of 22% of cancer patients / cachexia is therefore directly attributable for 20 % of cancer deaths (page 4); "There is considerable evidence that signaling through cytokines and myostatin/activin pathways has a role in cancer cachexia and anorexia (page 5) / Cytokines act on multiple target sites including bone marrow, myocytes, hepatocytes, adipocytes, endothelial cells, and neurons, and produce a complex cascade of biological responses leading to the wasting associated with cachexia..." (page 10)...). This should be minimized. 2. STAT3 activation is a common feature of muscle wasting..(page 6). There is no explanation on what STAT3 is, why is important etc.. So this sentence/paragraph has no real significance in this form. 3. It would be highly beneficial to add eye-catchy graphical presentations of the most important mechanisms that are involved in development in cancer cachexia, along with



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

the current therapeutic approaches used to target these mechanisms (signaling pathways) and/or improve the symptoms. 4. Typos and symbols should be checked (e.g., alpha – a, gamma – c..)

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15884

**Title:** Cancer cachexia; its mechanism and treatment

**Reviewer's code:** 00289666

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-25 16:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-06 01:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] 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"/> [ Y] 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 type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have written a concise review on a topic that gets too little attention. In general, the article is well-written and suitable for a general audience in addition to experts. There are two minor adjustments that will improve the article: 1. The section on NSAIDs ends abruptly, stating that the data were insufficient for interpreting their widespread use in practice. The authors should explain in what way the data were insufficient and more importantly what could be done to strengthen the current studies such that recommendations for use (or avoidance thereof) can be made. This section is the only one in the review that is lacking in that regard. 2. In the beta2-adrenergic agonists section, why put the "others" here? I am not a fan of the one sentence paragraph and if these potential drugs only warrant a mention without explanation, perhaps they belong in the table.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15884

**Title:** Cancer cachexia; its mechanism and treatment

**Reviewer's code:** 00227577

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-25 16:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-26 07:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a thorough review on our current understanding of cachexia, particularly in cancer patients. The authors extracted from a large body of literature, summarized possible molecular mechanisms known so far behind the pathology, discussed benefits vs. risks of the current treatment strategies, and presented future directions for interested individuals. It would be a good reference for people in this field once published.