

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21607

Title: MicroRNAs: New players in endometriosis

Reviewer's code: 03270452

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-08-06 08:43

Date reviewed: 2015-08-06 20:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the author described detailly the mRNA roles in the endometriosis, though the author cited many papers, but there were few recently new articles, and the authors should more pay attentions to the molecular mechanis.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21607

Title: MicroRNAs: New players in endometriosis

Reviewer's code: 00742364

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-08-06 08:43

Date reviewed: 2015-08-19 23:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting review article on a complex topic. The authors have done a good job compiling all the recent and compelling literature in the area. The main issue I have with the article is it doesn't seem to flow well for the reader. It's difficult to walk away with a sense of how this information can be used in the immediate term to drive research and clinical work. I offer specific comments below and suggestions to improve the flow are: 1) Suggest expanding the first para of the Intro (Pg 5) to include more epidemiology/statistics of those with endometriosis (age of women at diagnosis, maybe some ethnic profiles if they are available) 2) Lines 69-70, Pg 6, suggest adding 2-3 brief sentences regarding abnormal miRNA expression specifically in gyn pathologies. These are so related to endometriosis, I think it's worth expanding a little bit here. 3) Line 74, Pg 6, should be pioneering, not pioneer 4) Suggest moving the section on "peritoneal factors and endometriosis" up toward the front more, after the introduction and before miRNAs and endometriosis. It has a lot of background info on endometriosis being a multi-faceted disease and inflammatory process that would help the reader as they go through the review. I also suggest adding a paragraph to this section that discusses briefly the role that endometriosis has in cancer--specifically that it is a risk

factor for ovarian cancer. That info would help when the authors write in a later section about ovarian cancer. 5) Pg 9, line 155 "In a recent work" should be "in a recent publication" 6) Line 173, Pg 9: would delete definitely 7) Line 202, Pg 10 "apart from his" should be "apart from its" 8) Line 213, Pg 11, add the before authors 9) Biomarkers of Endometriosis section (Pg 11: Suggest moving this to the end, right before the Conclusion and calling it something like "Clinical Utility of miRNAs in endometriosis" 10) Lines 218-233, Pg 11: these lines need a little more English polishing. Insert "the fact that" after despite in line 218; "for a" in line 219 should be "of"; should in line 222 should be usually or typically, "a certain degree of expertise from clinicians is necessary" should replace lines 222-223; and "it is a costly procedure" should replace the last part of the sentence. Furthermore in line 224 should be deleted. Line 229 has a sentence that is incomplete--"the prognosis and the risk of...?"; line 230, this should be these. 11) Line 253 Suggest changing Anyhow to in any case 12) line 267, Pg 13, change sensible to "specific" 13) Line 306, Pg 14, Suggest moving "endometriosis, angiogenesis and miRNAs" section to come after the miRNA in endometriosis and retitling it something like "Potential Pathogenetic mechanisms of miRNA in Endometriosis" 14) Pg 15, lines 331-332 Change to "some authors suggest this mechanism may reduce..." 15) Pg 16, Conclusion: suggest expanding this section to include future research directions, and future directions for physicians who treat endometriosis. 16) Suggest adding a table that summarizes the findings from the different section--something that lists the miRNAs involved and where they are found (endometrium, PF, etc) to easily give the reader a snapshot of the findings.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21607

Title: MicroRNAs: New players in endometriosis

Reviewer's code: 03270459

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-08-06 08:43

Date reviewed: 2015-08-20 16:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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

I do appreciate the authors' effort on this paper entitled "microRNAs: new players in endometriosis". This is an interesting review exploring the exact role of miRNAs in the pathophysiology of endometriosis on the basis of the interpretation of previous similar articles. Language was good and concise. I recommended a publication of this paper in the magazine only after the complement of some information. 1、 Better to add more information on the role of miRNAs in the pathogenesis of endometriosis. 2、 Citations of recent and relevant literature on various types of miRNA, such as miR-30c, miR-200c in endometrial carcinoma are needed. 3、 The author could first point out the current application of microRNA in cancer oncogenesis, diagnosis and therapy, and to increase importance and relevance of conclusion to the topic, whether microRNAs will be a potential diagnostic biomarker in endometriosis is the part to be more discussed.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21607

Title: MicroRNAs: New players in endometriosis

Reviewer's code: 00742253

Reviewer's country: Lithuania

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-08-06 08:43

Date reviewed: 2015-08-21 18:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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"/> 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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to congratulate the Authors on a very good paper. This is an interesting review and could be of interest for the readers. Because this is a review, I suggest to assess the methodological quality of published papers.