

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30908

Title: Do pathological variables have prognostic significance in rectal adenocarcinoma treated with neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy and surgery?

Reviewer's code: 02861643

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-10-25 09:00

Date reviewed: 2016-11-02 20:25

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 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 checked="" 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

Dworak TRG grade is widely used in evaluating the effects of neoadjuvant therapy on rectal carcinoma. However, the inter-observer discordance does exist. The most interesting finding of this manuscript is the authors applied a simplified two-tiered system, which has prognostic significance and may also reduce the inter-observer discordance. The authors also put "careful histological examination is mandatory in order to exclude residual mucinous carcinoma" in their conclusion, however, this has been well known and their study did not add new evidence in this aspect. The tables are too complicate, especially table 2 and table3. I suggest the authors should better simplify them. In addition, table2 and table 3 both have two "Dworak Regression grade", what is the difference?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30908

Title: Do pathological variables have prognostic significance in rectal adenocarcinoma treated with neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy and surgery?

Reviewer's code: 03669108

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-10-25 09:00

Date reviewed: 2016-12-03 00:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read a good article with a well designed study, a significant group of patients and an excellent statistics. I believe you can extract more conclusions from such a good study, but even now you wrote a very useful article.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30908

Title: Do pathological variables have prognostic significance in rectal adenocarcinoma treated with neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy and surgery?

Reviewer's code: 03478870

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-10-25 09:00

Date reviewed: 2016-11-27 18:36

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 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

The Dworak system is now widely applied on rectal cancer who had received preoperative radiochemotherapy with 5-FU/50Gy. However, the Dworak system described in late 90s based on a very small sample size. The most impressive sample size of 215 patients in this retrospective analyze was expected to improve the scientific nature of tumor regressive grade. The authors applied a simplified two-tiered system in order to more consistent with prognostic significance. The authors analyzed lots of clinical pathological variations factors which could correlated to the DFS, CSS and DFS/CSS. 1.The authors recommended careful histological examination is mandatory in order to exclude residual mucinous carcinoma. Consider the paper tried to clarify the relationship between clinical pathological variations and the prognostic significance. In discussion part of the manuscript, this point is better to be highlighted. 2. The author also mentioned merely twice that T and/or N unchanging/upstaging was significantly more frequent in female patients. This is attractive for readers needed to be discussed in some extent, or the authors should delete the related contents. 3. The tables are too complicate, especially table 1. I suggest the authors should be



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>

extensively simplified all tables. For instance, the contents of table2 have some overlap with the figure 3, and, the table 2 and the table 3 both have two "Dworak Regression grade". 3. Did all patients received the 5-fluorouracil? And according to the protocol in Modena center, the dose and schedule of the drug infusion? 4. Although it is clearly an issue in any non-randomized study, cTNM and yTNM staging had been performed by using the different types of examination. What is the difference of them? CT and MRI and B-us?