

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 24044

Title: Efficacy, safety, and dose comparison of degarelix for the treatment of prostate cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00505710

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-03 19:05

Date reviewed: 2016-01-04 00:48

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

Needs to be reviewed by native speaker of English. Very few studies for a meta analysis.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 24044

Title: Efficacy, safety, and dose comparison of degarelix for the treatment of prostate cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00505671

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-03 19:05

Date reviewed: 2016-01-16 23:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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

Dear Authors, it is a well written analysis of the existing evidence regarding Degarelix in prostate cancer. The results are limited by the lack of good quality RCTs.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 24044

Title: Efficacy, safety, and dose comparison of degarelix for the treatment of prostate cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00505655

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-03 19:05

Date reviewed: 2016-01-23 19:48

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

Authors performed a meta-analysis and systematic review to compare the efficacy, safety, and dosage regimens of degarelix for prostate cancer (PCa). This is an interesting and original study. However it has several limitations and needs some revisions before publication: 1. Did the study follow the PRISMA statements? A flow chart of study selection should be added. 2. In the methods section the terms "and so on", "etc" should be avoided. 3. The main limitations of this study is the lack of oncological data (overall, and cancer specific survival, and metastasis free survival). It should be discussed in the limitations of the study. 4. The type of androgen deprivation should be reported for each study (i.e: intermittent versus continuous).