Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 47600

Title: Subcellular expression of maspin – from normal tissue to tumor cells

Reviewer's code: 02990500

Reviewer's country: Lebanon

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-19 09:23

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-20 09:40

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[Y] Grade E: Do not publish		[Y] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major comment This paper is a so-called systematic review however it is more near to a narrative review with the aim to perform a synthesis on "maspin expression" in different tissues and organs (i.e. normal and cancer). The topic is of clinical implication, since authors concluded that the maspin expression in most of the malignant cancers

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

was demonstrated to be an independent prognostic and predictive factor. The finding is relevant and conclusions are strong, however authors did not reached this finding in a systematic way, in other words they were so far from the PRISMA guidelines in the conduction of their review, and it is obvious that authors are not familiar with. In my modest opinion, and in order to avoid any bias a well-conducted systematic review is requested, authors are encouraged also to submit a 27-PRISMA checklist for transparency. Moreover they should do their best to conduct a meta-analysis to give more robustness to their results, as well as there discussion and conclusions. Other major comment Title Should be changed to read as systematic review as well as meta-analysis Abstract Poor and weak, should be structured as follows: • Background and Objectives • Data sources (Medline, PubMed etc.) • Study eligibility criteria • Participants • Interventions • Study appraisal and synthesis methods (Nice checklist etc.) • Results • Limitations • Conclusions and implications of key findings • Systematic review registration number (PROSPERO registry) Introduction It should include two important points • Authors should describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. • Moreover they should provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design known as PICOS statement. Methodology Is really absent and should be structured in subsections as follows: • Protocol (PRISMA) and registration (PROSPERO) • Eligibility criteria • Information sources • Search strategy (MeSH terms combination is a must) • Study selection • Data collection process Results • The number of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review should be clearly indicted, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, and clearly described. • Moreover for each study included in the systematic review, authors should present characteristics for which data were extracted and provide the citations, as well as the

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

assessment of the risk of bias within and across studies. Discussion Fragmented and full of speculations • The main finding should be summarized including the strength of evidence for each main outcome, in addition to the limitation of the included studies. • Authors should also come with the clinical implications of their findings, and the new direction of the future research.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No