

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6205

**Title:** hENT1 expression is predictive of gemcitabine outcome in pancreatic cancer; a systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 02822922

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-09 10:51

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-25 02:26

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 systematic review is of great interest as it focuses on a clinical meaningful problem. Unfortunately, prognosis for patients diagnosed with pancreatic cancer is extremely poor as the majority of the patients are inoperable due to advance metastatic disease and only few respond to standard treatment (i.e. gemcitabine). However, some revisions need to be made as the review is not publishable in its current form.

1. Non-english articles should be included in the search as this is a systematic review
2. Page 5, characteristics of selected studies: line 2 authors should add references after Belgium.Canada.. etc
3. results section: when describing the results in terms of OS, the authors should detail this better (i.e. adding the number of months). Although they included a nice table, the readers should be able to get more information by reading the text only.
4. Discussion section: The first three lines belong to background and aim and should not be repeated in the discussion section.
5. English language should be properly reviewed. In details:
6. Page 7 line 17 was should be replaced by were
7. Page 8: a) line 12: tumours. This includes should be replaced by tumours including b)last line: have should be edited in has
8. Page 9: a) line 7 the results was should be replaced by were b) line 10: that is important should be that are .. c) last line again were should be replaced by was
9. Page 10, line 11: do not repeat in twice

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6205

**Title:** hENT1 expression is predictive of gemcitabine outcome in pancreatic cancer; a systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 02441494

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-09 10:51

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-16 21:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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

Dear authors, The authors have obtained most of relevant published papers, and summarized the critical points. The review is the first report, which indicated hENT1 gene over expression in pancreatic carcinoma being a potential predictive value for gemcitabine treatment.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6205

**Title:** hENT1 expression is predictive of gemcitabine outcome in pancreatic cancer; a systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 02860797

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-09 10:51

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-19 12:22

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dr. Nordh and colleagues systematically review the topic that hENT1 expression and outcomes in pancreatic cancer patients with gemcitabine treatment. Particularly they evaluated the role of hENT1 as a predictive rather than prognostic factor. The included studies showed significant heterogeneity regarding treatment regimes that patients received. However, the authors implied that this heterogeneity would hardly influence the reliability of their conclusions. The better outcome in high/positive hENT1 group thus might mix with influence from other treatments such as surgery and radiation, which could alter the efficacy of gemcitabine in pancreatic cancer. Given this shortcomings, the manuscript showed a good review in the topic and was still valuable to understand the role of hENT1 as well as possible benefits for clinical use. Minor comments: 1. I suggest focused discussion on the underlying influence of different regimens patients had. 2. In Response rate section, is the number of patients underwent PR, SD and PD was totally 24, however 34 patients were evaluated RR. What was the outcome of the left 10 patients?

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6205

**Title:** hENT1 expression is predictive of gemcitabine outcome in pancreatic cancer; a systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 00182439

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-09 10:51

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-19 14:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ Y] 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
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[ Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors presented a good review regarding an association between hENT1 and response to gemcitabine in patients with pancreatic cancer. The manuscript is very good and needs only minor changes before being accepted for publication. The authors should include information about the costs of hENT1 testing and limitations, if any, that may preclude this test to be used widespread. any specific patient group?