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
ESPS Manuscript NO: 3929
Title: Effect of siRNA mediated knockdown of COX-2 and p65 on Snail and E-Cadherin in gastric cancer cells
Reviewer code: 02461125
Science editor: Wang, Jin-Lei
Date sent for review: 2013-06-04 14:38
Date reviewed: 2013-06-08 09:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Liu et al described the study on the regulatory role of Cox-2 in NF-κB/Snail signaling as well as the expression of E-cadherin, the downregulation of which is implicated in tumor invasion. Through inhibition or Cox-2, activation of Cox-2 downstream signaling via PGE2, or knockdown of NF-κB, they examined the altered expression of Snail and E-cadherin, concluding that in gastric cancer cells, Cox-2 activates NF-κB to upregulate Snail, which in turn repressed the expression of E-cadherin. The results presented by the authors are benificial to elucidating the mechanism underlying Cox-2-mediated cancer progression and metastasis. However, the data are not convincing yet and further study is probably needed in order to get the conclusion the authors claimed. Major points: 1.Although the detailed experiments and data may vary significantly, the purpose and conclusion of this study is very similar to the corresponding author's published results (Chen et al. Int J Mol Med, 2013; 32:93-100). Authors should address the major difference between the two studies. 2.Fig. 3 contains data which may be inconsistent with the suggested Cox-2/PGE2/NF-κB/Snail/E-cadherin pathway. For example, given that NF-κB acts downstream of PGE2, when comparing lane 5 with lanes 3 and 1, decreased Snail and upregulated E-cadherin are anticipated; when comparing lane 3 with lane 1, Snail should be increased while E-cadherin should be downregulated. Neither of these alterations was actually observed in Fig. 3. In addition, "scramble siRNA" is not a definitive label, and "PEG2" should be "PGE2". 3.Statistical analysis should be performed from Fig. 1 to Fig. 3. Minor points: 1.It is unnecessary to present the sequences of each of the 2 strands of siRNA which are completely complementary. 2.Overexposure of the β-actin blots seems inappropriate for a loading control.

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
ESPS Manuscript NO: 3929
Title: Effect of siRNA mediated knockdown of COX-2 and p65 on Snail and E-Cadherin in gastric cancer cells
Reviewer code: 02523299
Science editor: Wang, Jin-Lei
Date sent for review: 2013-06-04 14:38
Date reviewed: 2013-06-19 22:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[Y] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a very interesting paper on the molecular biology of COX-2 and E-Cadhering via the NF-KB and Snail pathways. The methodology and reasoning is sound along with the results and logical discussion at the end.I found some of the dialogue slightly confusing however and I believe this paper would benefit from a less complicated array of figures. Table 1+2 are of no relevance to the reader and could be removed and figures 1, 2+3 could be more polished and user friendly. They do not reproduce well. Take home message and future implications should stand out more.