

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: 2521

Title: Neuroendocrine gastroenteropancreatic neoplasias are on the rise: Epidemiological changes in

Germany

Reviewer code: 00057400

Science editor: Huang, Xin-Zhen

Date sent for review: 2013-02-26 16:27

Date reviewed: 2013-03-11 00:54

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is well written. I have a few minor suggestions: 1. While I recognize that this paper likely includes high grade neuroendocrine tumors, I would recommend using the abbreviation NET instead of NEN throughout the manuscript. 2. Introduction, paragraph 2: Pancreatic "endocrine" tumors should be "neuroendocrine" and abbreviated "PNET." 3. Results, paragraph 1: "Epidemiology of" This line doesn't make sense where it is located and represents a sentence fragment. 4. Results, Frequency, 1st sentence should: "...from 1976 to 1988 and 1820 from ..." Delete "ones" 5. Results, Tumor site, line 3: "intervals" 6. Results, Second primary neoplasms, line 8: "2821" 7. Figure 6, x-axis labels: should change "mamma" to "breast" 8. Discussion can be shortened. In particular, the section describing NET development as a result of PPI usage adds little to the paper and can be removed.



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: 2521

Title: Neuroendocrine gastroenteropancreatic neoplasias are on the rise: Epidemiological changes in

Germany

Reviewer code: 00253959

Science editor: Huang, Xin-Zhen

Date sent for review: 2013-02-26 16:27

Date reviewed: 2013-03-12 19:24

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this interesting project the authors investigated the incidence of gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms (GEP-NEN) in two different time periods, namely from 1976 - 1988 and from 1998 - 2006 in East Germany. They used the East German National Cancer Registry (DDR Krebsregister for the years 1976 - 1988) and the Joint Cancer Registry for the time period 1998 - 2006 comprising the federal states Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, Saxony, Brandenburg, Thuringia and Berlin. From the results they demonstrated convincingly that the incidence rate increased considerably for men and women and for the different locations of the GEP-NEN. However, they quite clearly demonstrated in the discussion section that this increase is mainly due to different reasons: Nomenclature has been changed; improvement of general awareness and immunological diagnoses; availability of the German National Programme of Colorectal Cancer Screening since October 2002; better imaging diagnoses. In fact these considerations in the discussion show clearly that not the incidence rate increased, but rather the detection rate of GEP-NEN. Accordingly, the title of the paper should be changed because it is not clear at all whether the authors observed a rise of the tumor incidence rather than an increase in the detection rate. Accordingly, the conclusion in the summary section and at the end of the discussion should be adapted accordingly. An important finding of the project is that almost 17 per cent of GEP-NEN patients showed second primary malignancies and therefore screening for other malignancies in those patients should be important for the future. There are a number of shortcomings which should be addressed: Unfortunately the pages of this manuscript are not numbered. Therfore, I started the numbering giving the title page number 1. Title of the manuscript should be changed. Page 2: the conclusion on page 2 should be



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

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

changed because the incidence of GEP-NEN did not increase about 5-fold but rather the detection rate increased accordingly. Introduction, page 3, first paragraph: Here you describe the porportional anatomical distribution of neuroendocrine cells displaying "two thirds" "a quarter" and "10 %". This is confusing. Please express the proportions all in percentages. Page 3, second paragraph: the references mentioned here for the incidence of pancreatic endocrine tumors cover a time period of 32 years (1968 - 2000)! In the last paragraph of this page you represent a study showing an increase of the incidence of NEN in this time period. Therfore, you better should state her: how was the incidence in 1968 in comparison to 2000! Page 5, first paragraph: please define here what you mean by "crude incidence rate". Page 5 (Material and Methods), second paragraph: the information of this phrase is also given in the first paragraph in line 3 and 4 and can therefore be omitted. Page 5, fourth paragraph: the reference of Doll, Payne et al. 1966 is not listed in the reference list. Page 6 (Results), first paragraph: in the Material and Methods section you reported to investigate the incidence rate in the new federal states and Berlin. However, in the part of the results section Berlin is not mentioned anymore. Page 7, fig. 1: in the figure legend you mention Berlin again. If you included Berlin please confirm this on page 6 at the beginning of the results section. Fig. 2 & 3: these figures appear to be completely overloaded with figures and columns and should be considerably reduced. Page 15, second primary neoplasma: please do not mention in the first paragraph repeatedly "second, third or fourth neoplasm". In this paragraph please refer to fig. 5. Figs. 5: the denominations in this figure are confusing. Please replace in the abscissa "one, two and three" by "second, third and fourth". Furthermore, change fig. 5A into 5B and 5B into 5A. Fig. 6: Please replace this figure by a simple table, if at all. Page 21, first paragraph: the la