

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 3465

Title: Lymph node metastasis in gastric cardiac adenocarcinoma in male patients :A comparative analysis of with female patients

Reviewer code: 02441486

Science editor: Wang, Jin-Lei

Date sent for review: 2013-05-03 14:26

Date reviewed: 2013-05-16 22:54

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper title as "Lymph node metastasis in gastric cardiac adenocarcinoma in male patients :A comparative analysis of with female patients", however, the study mainly focus on the relationship between Lymph node metastasis and clinicopathologic feature of gastric cardiac adenocarcinoma. There is no special difference on gender performance of Lymph node metastasis of gastric cardiac cancer, and this point have been discussed in others published paper. So, the authors should further illustrated the purpose and significance of this study, as well as told reader the differences of this paper compared with others previous studies.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 3465

Title: Lymph node metastasis in gastric cardiac adenocarcinoma in male patients :A comparative analysis of with female patients

Reviewer code: 02478796

Science editor: Wang, Jin-Lei

Date sent for review: 2013-05-03 14:26

Date reviewed: 2013-05-28 11:40

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I congratulate the authors for an excellent effort. Just a few minor comments: 1. Title of the manuscript needs checking. ".... A comparative analysis of with female patients...." does not make sense. 2. It is somewhat unfortunate that, despite a long observational period (>10 yrs), the sample size remains small (n=146). As rightly highlighted, a future attempt in expanding the population size should hopefully provide further insights. It would be worth mentioning how you anticipate this could be achieved?