

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8762

Title: Knockdown of osteopontin gene suppresses the growth and angiogenesis of colon cancer cells

Reviewer code: 00049578

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-06 20:01

Date reviewed: 2014-01-14 23:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Wu et al. describes an osteopontin gene silencing experiment carried out in LoVo cells. Hypoexpressing cells were found to grow more slowly, to adhere less to (possibly) fibronectin and to be less invasive, and to express lower levels of VEGF, MMP2/9 and perhaps uPA. This is a follow up of their previous study showing essentially the same but adding the protein or transfecting the gene. Hence the data fit in nicely but are hardly surprising. Major comments 1. The presentation is below standard. This involves English errors here and there (for instance in the abstract, fourth sentence; worlds, despite/but; etc), words broken at the end of lines, and so forth. My favourite is 'The OPN-antibody function of anti-angiogenesis was far more than merely VEGF-antibody and PI3K or EGR inhibitor', which probably means that OPN had a higher impact than PI3K or EGR in the previous paper, but is rather obscure as it is. 2. The presentation of the results is marred by the repetition of data in figures and tables in all instances. Also, there is no point in Figs. 1 and 2 except perhaps as complementary online material. In fact, Figures 3 and 4 are quite superfluous as well, they could be combined in a single figure or table with the only vector that was used. 3. The title states incorrectly that the silencing OPN reduces angiogenesis, this has not been even tested. Minor comments 1. Units and figures should be separated by an space. 2. Fn = fibronectin? CCK-8 = Sigma WST kit? 3. Why the repetition of the lanes in Fig. 1?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8762

Title: Knockdown of osteopontin gene suppresses the growth and angiogenesis of colon cancer cells

Reviewer code: 00042772

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-06 20:01

Date reviewed: 2014-01-17 21:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google 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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Wu et al provides an important contribution in the evaluation of the role of osteopontin in the pathogenesis of colon cancer. It also recognizes good translational development. For this reasons I think it is worthy of being published in WJG.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8762

Title: Knockdown of osteopontin gene suppresses the growth and angiogenesis of colon cancer cells

Reviewer code: 00057684

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-06 20:01

Date reviewed: 2014-01-20 11:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors of "Knockdown of osteopontin gene suppresses the growth and angiogenesis of colon cancer cells" studied Osteopontin role in a colon-cancer cell line. The OPN Knockdown Lovo cells by siRNA reduced cell proliferation, adhesion and invasion. The knockdown of OPN also decreased the quantities of VEGF, MMP-2, MMP-9 and uPA. The experiments methods are adequate for the results. However, it would be better if they had used OPN overexpression in addition to silencing OPN. The manuscript needs to be polished for grammatical and spelling errors before publishing.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8762

Title: Knockdown of osteopontin gene suppresses the growth and angiogenesis of colon cancer cells

Reviewer code: 00068168

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-06 20:01

Date reviewed: 2014-01-21 22:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study used in vitro knockout approach to find that OPN was involved in proliferation, invasion, adhesion and antiangiogen of human colon cancer cells. The study is well designed and preformed, and of some significance in cancer therapy. There are some writing errors as shown below. Abstract: 1. What is Lovo cells? It is better to describe it when the item is firstly presented. 2. "Know down" or knowdown? Choose one to be consistent. Result: 1. Mind the grammar, "has" in "There has no significant difference between Lovo-NC and Lovo" should be "is". "While there has no significant difference between Lovo-NC and Lovo, indicating the safety and efficiency of the plasmid vector." is not appropriate. 2. What is Fn? It is better to describe it when the item is firstly presented. Discussion: 1. The literature review is too long (417 words) before discussing their own data. The first paragraph should state their main findings directly. 2. In the first paragraph, "Our preliminary studies have shown that OPN may influence tumor cell biological characteristics[13]. The principal findings of this study were that both endogenous OPN expression (via stable transfection)". The two sentences mislead the readers that the two sentences are describing one study, in fact, as the references showed, they are two studies. 3. "The present study" means the authour's study, but the expression is often referred to other studies. 4. In discussion, it is better to compare your own data with references, instead of repeating your own findings as the results. Figure: 1. Figure 3, the Y axis should be marked OPN mRNA instead of ".... value"; 2. Figure 5, Y axis should be marked with Cell proliferation (OD value). Same with other figures. The significance should be marked. 3. Figure 8, Y axis should state the concentration unit.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8762

Title: Knockdown of osteopontin gene suppresses the growth and angiogenesis of colon cancer cells

Reviewer code: 00030205

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-06 20:01

Date reviewed: 2014-01-28 20:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting work on the knockdown of the osteopontin gene showing effects that may have future clinical applications in colon cancer. These concerns need to be addressed: *Are the examiners blinded for the different cell lines? * What is the groups experience in performing this type of studies? References? *Regarding the discussion. There are no discussion of the limitations, pitfalls and weaknesses of the study. *The discussion is only repeating the information from the introduction, methods and results. *Many statements in the discussion lack references. * Possible clinical applications of this finding need to be discussed more in detail.