

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7841

Title: A Retrospective Analysis of Adjuvant Chemotherapy for Curatively Resected Gastric Cancer in China: Answers to Questions in Real Clinical Practice

Reviewer code: 00533358

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-12-04 15:01

Date reviewed: 2013-12-07 19:03

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	<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 TO AUTHORS

This is a retrospective study, comparing curative gastrectomy with limited or standard lymphadenectomy vs curative gastrectomy with limited or standard lymphadenectomy plus adjuvant chemotherapy in LAGC patients. If the English is revised, I believe that is an interesting and well presented retrospective study demonstrating the efficacy and safety of postoperative platinum/fluoropyrimidines.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7841

Title: A Retrospective Analysis of Adjuvant Chemotherapy for Curatively Resected Gastric Cancer in China: Answers to Questions in Real Clinical Practice

Reviewer code: 02571987

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-12-04 15:01

Date reviewed: 2013-12-12 00:20

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	<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 TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting article about postoperative chemotherapy in gastric cancer. I have some clarifications that I think would improve the article some. What was the selection between those who got chemo, and which one got the different kinds of chemo, sound like this is a major selection bias. And was there difference between early and late period, if so, maybe relative survival instead of overall survival should have been used. It is said in the multivariate analysis that localization was a factor, but what localization? And could that influence the survival difference partly? It is said that extension of lymph node dissection is measured by the number of lymph nodes harvested, but that could also be a matter of tumor biology or the quality of the pathology.