

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 12910

Title: The Effect of Supervised Exercise on Aerobic Capacity in Cancer Survivors: Adherence and Workload Predict Variance in Effect

Reviewer code: 02444745

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-29 23:29

Date reviewed: 2014-08-26 11:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you very much for an excellent systematic review.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 12910

Title: The Effect of Supervised Exercise on Aerobic Capacity in Cancer Survivors: Adherence and Workload Predict Variance in Effect

Reviewer code: 02454978

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-29 23:29

Date reviewed: 2014-09-05 14:27

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"/> Existing	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Strength of this review paper:

- Meticulous efforts undertaken to track down unpublished data
- Language restriction was not applied as well.

Weakness:

- I question the validity of studying too many moderators in the meta-regression analysis, and hence, I suggest limiting them to say 3-4 essential parameters.
- The Discussion section appears a little disorganised.

All in all, I recommend acceptance of this paper with minor-moderate revision.