

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9751

Title: Solitary mediastinal lymph node recurrence after curative resection of colon cancer

Reviewer code: 00068720

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-02-27 17:27

Date reviewed: 2014-03-08 21:55

| 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 manuscript obtained quite much useful information of colon cancer. However, I have several questions: 1. The quality of all the figures is poor. Figure 2 and 4 are not clear, should update, or add give higher magnification figures. 2. In "figure legend", what is the meaning of "a: ??10, b: ??50"? The patient's basic information should be added to the "figure legend" section. 3. Style and content of references need to be revised, e.g. ref.4,8,11,13,14,15.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9751

Title: Solitary mediastinal lymph node recurrence after curative resection of colon cancer

Reviewer code: 02861605

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-02-27 17:27

Date reviewed: 2014-03-10 00:37

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
General Comments

The authors have written an article highlighting a rare entity, metastatic solitary mediastinal lymph node after resection of colon cancer in the form of two cases. There are some minor changes that would improve its clarity, but overall provides a well written forum for discussion of an interesting and rare event.

Specific Comments

Title – The title is accurate and states the content of the article well.

Abstract – Including the description of the surgeries in the abstract is somewhat confusing to the reader. The title and beginning of the abstract indicate the cases to be recurrence of colorectal cancer as a metastatic solitary mediastinal lymph node. When the surgeries are mentioned here discussing involvement of other structures involved during the surgery, it seems as though the cases are not actually solitary mediastinal lymph node recurrence. When the surgical descriptions are provided in the body of the article, it is much clearer. Therefore, perhaps removing the description of the surgeries from the abstract may be prudent.

Introduction – The introduction is clear and concise in laying out the importance of the article.

Case 1 & 2 – While the case descriptions are a bit lengthy, all the information does seem necessary to understand the case in context. The cases are described in appropriate detail for the reader to understand the patient’s clinical scenario to understand the presentation, treatment, recurrence, and follow up.

Discussion – As this is a case report, indicating that there was some sort of methodological review for other similar case reports should be discussed as opposed to saying “to the best of our knowledge..” It is important to discuss the process as to how the two other known cases the authors are aware of were discovered (i.e. review of Medline for case reports, etc). The discussion of this rare event is well done as well as the review of lymph node metastasis pathophysiology along with the significance in regards to prognosis. In the discussion line 153, it says “confirmation of abdominal node metastasis” should probably say “confirmation of abdominal lymph node metastasis.”

Figures – The figures legends are appropriate, concise, and well described.

References – The references seem appropriate, relevant, and updated.