



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2836

Title: Analysis of somatic molecular changes, clinicopathological features and family history of CRC in Tunisian patients

Reviewer code: 00053417

Science editor: s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-03-20 09:06

Date reviewed: 2013-03-20 21:37

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"/> Existed	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Screening the subjects at risk of colorectal cancer (CRC) is important. In this manuscript, the authors retrospectively reviewed the histo-pathological features, molecular changes and family history of 51 Tunisian CRC patients. Among many genetic and clinical variables, MUC5AC expression was concluded to be useful in the screening of patients at high risk of CRC susceptibility. There are some reservations about the study: 1 The finding of MUC5AC expression has been published. 2 The small sample size is not powerful to support the conclusion that only MUC5AC expression, but not other variables, was risk factor of CRC susceptibility. 3 A multivariate regression analysis is suggested to analyze the results.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2836

Title: Analysis of somatic molecular changes, clinicopathological features and family history of CRC in Tunisian patients

Reviewer code: 00057100

Science editor: s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-03-20 09:06

Date reviewed: 2013-03-27 10:07

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

It is not clear why the authors selected normal mucosa from different patient who underwent CRC resection. Why they did not selected normal mucosa from the same patient? Are the samples from the 51 primary colorectal carcinomas from family members? The designed primers for the TP53 mutation screening must be described. It will allow future authors to use them if necessary. The length of the exon and introns should also be described. Mutation screening for KRAS, CTNNB1 and BRAF genes were screened using sequencing. The primers used or the reference should be described. The first sentence in BRAF mutations results should be re written. Table 2, I recommend to write only the significant results. The other option is to change NS for the actual p value. It is not appropriate to write numbers and NS. It seems that all results are significant using chi2. In that case to write in the table chi2 is unnecessary. The authors can write a small sentence in the legend of the table remarking that (as they did in table 4, 5 and 6) Table 4. As in Table 2 Table 5. As in Table 2 It will be interesting to see some pictures of the immunohistochemistry and PCR