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 http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology
ESPS manuscript NO: 21284
Title: Impact of RAS and BRAF mutations on carcinoembryonic antigen production and pattern of colorectal metastases
Reviewer's code: 03062291
Reviewer's country: Russia
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-07-10 09:02
Date reviewed: 2015-08-26 20:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[Y] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In general, it is a well-written paper that has however several weak traits. First of all, the sample size is quite low for making good statistical calculations. Therefore it is not surprising that P-values in some cases are really high (<60 age group for testing RAS and BRAF status and the group with CEA levels <5ng/ml). As a results, some data seemed to be inconclusive. In fact, authors showed too many negative data: no correlations in association of RAS/BRAF with demographic characteristics; no association between BRAF mutations and age or peritoneal metastases; no association between RAS mutations and lung metastases; no differences in CEA levels between BRAF mutants anmd BRAF wt of mCRCs. One additional point is the difference between Onco 44 and Onco 48 assay which I would like authors to clarify. If the only difference is these 4 additional genes, then Onco 48 is enough to be used. If not, authors should better explain the methodological difference. In general, with these kinds of negative results the manuscript may not be a valuable source of data to be used for any clinical prognostic purposes. However, I do appreciate authors fairness and attempts to achieve the best from the obtained data. Therefore, I suggest this manuscript for publication in WJGO

upon minor revision.