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: 6645
Title: The pathophysiological roles of Pim-3 kinase in pancreatic cancer development and progression
Reviewer code: 02520050
Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan
Date sent for review: 2013-10-27 11:47
Date reviewed: 2013-12-09 22:08

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	[ ] 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

This review of Pim-3 and its role in pancreatic cancer is an interesting piece of work that highlights some important cellular and molecular interactions in pancreatic carcinogenesis and progression. I think this would be of interest to the readership in helping to educate researchers and clinicians about Pim-3. Below are my comments. 1. I would suggest that a native English speaker review and edit the manuscript. While it is generally readable, there are some syntax errors that detract from the readers' experience. 2. To help the reader, consider re-organizing section 5 such that there are 4 subheadings, as you have indicated in the introduction of section 5: survival signaling, regulation of cell cycle progression, regulation of protein synthesis. That paragraph on page 11 is confusing, as you outline four activities involved in carcinogenesis, but the last sentence then says 'two aspects' of Pim-3 effects on carcinogenesis. 3. The paragraph on K-ras mutation and activation is under the 'tumor microenvironment' subheading, but also contains information about Pim-1 expression and prostate cancer. This should either be clarified or eliminated, so as not to focus on prostate cancer. 4. Some of the material does not directly pertain to pancreatic cancer, and could potentially be eliminated. An example is the first paragraph of page 11, with the discussion of hippocampul induction. Another paragraph that could be cut is the first one on page 14, discussing hypoxic microenvironments and HIF. Only the last sentence mentions Pim-3, which has nothing to do with the paragraph on hypoxia.

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: 6645
Title: The pathophysiological roles of Pim-3 kinase in pancreatic cancer development and progression
Reviewer code: 00037998
Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan
Date sent for review: 2013-10-27 11:47
Date reviewed: 2014-01-03 12:35

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Manuscript_20131025171603 In the review titled "The pathophysiological roles of Pim-3 kinase in pancreatic cancer development and progression", the authors tried to update the knowledge about the tole of Pim-3 in pancreatic cancer development and progression, and to recommend Pim-3 as a candidate molecule for targeted therapy of pancreatic cancer. While the structure, regulation and possible biological functions of Pim-1, 2, and 3 had been stated in a lot of details, the roles of these Pims, particular Pim-3 in pancreatic cancer have not been demonstrated and summarized clearly. There is not enough evidence to support the argument that "Pim-3 may be a candidate molecule to develop molecular targeting drugs against pancreatic cancer". Some suggestions and concerns: 1. Provide an abbreviation list to explain the detail meanings of most abbreviations appeared in the review. 2. Are there experimental evidences to support the argument in page 10, lines 1 and 2? 3. What was stated in page 11, paragraph 4, second sentence, was not shown in figure 3. 4. How did Pim-3 affect Wnt/?-catenin pathway is not clearly stated in the 3rd paragraph of page 12, there the conclusion that "Pim kinases including Pim-3 may sustain cell survival by modulating Wnt/?-catenin …" is luck of support. 5. There is not enough evidence to make the claim in the last sentence of page 15, 2nd paragraph.

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: 6645
Title: The pathophysiological roles of Pim-3 kinase in pancreatic cancer development and progression
Reviewer code: 00033061
Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan
Date sent for review: 2013-10-27 11:47
Date reviewed: 2014-01-06 22:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] 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)	[Y] 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
General comments: The manuscript explores an interesting and actual topic. However some weaknesses should be highlighted: 1. The paper is a bit long. It could be more easily readable if shortened. 2. The paper seems more a general and descriptive review about Pim family kinase rather than a targeted review on the roles of Pim-3 in pancreatic cancer development. 3. Moreover the Authors often extrapolate the mechanism of action of Pim -3 kinase from the one of Pim -1 and -2, without a direct evidence (in the introduction actually justifying it with their similar - but not identical - gene sequence). In detail, on page 7, second and third paragraphs, they refer only to the Pim -1 effects, concluding that Pim -3 affects cell cycle and carcinogenesis only on the basis of sequence similarity with Pim -1. Only as an example, they infer the role of Pim -3 only on the basis of similarity to Pim -1, also on page 12, third paragraph and on page 15 (last line). 4. The Authors often discuss the different roles of Pim -3 , but not always specifically focusing on the pancreatic carcinogenesis. For example, in the abstract, lines 10-12, they expound the effects of Pim-3 on the liver. The same on page 5 and, again, in the chapter 4 (Biological functions) where the role of Pim-3 on pancreatic cancer development comes only after 3 pages and it is explained only in a single paragraph (page 11 second paragraph). 5. The purpose of the manuscript was not clearly stated because the Authors never explained why they want to focus on Pim -3 protein and in particular on its functions on pancreas carcinoigenesis. A sentence should be added to clarify the aim. 6. In conclusion, I think the manuscript should focus more closely on the topic mentioned in the title. Specific comments: 1 . Introduction, second paragraph: the Authors wrote “Provirus integrating site Moloney”. Consider writing “: Provirus integration site for Moloney…” 2 . Page 4, line 4 The Authors

wrote “In this Reviwe, we aim to highlight the pathophysiological roles of Pim-3 in development and progression of caner, particularly pancreatic cancer. Please correct Reviwe with review and caner with cancer. 3. Page 4, line 8 please substitute “cancer therapy” with “antineoplastic therapy”. 4 . Page 10 lines 18-22 : missing reference (probably # 33). 5 . Page 12 , last paragraph : the sentence refers to a work already published by themselves (ref# 76) but the results of that work concerned the effects on the liver and not on the pancreatic effects. 6 . Page 17 , Chapter 7 , last sentence: It should be better if the Authors write " Studies focusing ON THESE aspects" rather than "the study ... " .

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: 6645
Title: The pathophysiological roles of Pim-3 kinase in pancreatic cancer development and progression
Reviewer code: 00031006
Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan
Date sent for review: 2013-10-27 11:47
Date reviewed: 2014-01-13 21:28

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	[ ] 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
In their current Review Li et al. resumed the provided literature about the pathophysiological features of Pim-3 kinase, especially in pancreatic cancer development and progression, and stated the idea of Pim-3 as a potential new therapeutical target for patients with pancreatic cancer. Overall, this review is written clearly and understandable, still I have the following comments: Major comments: 1. Some parts of the paper are citated insufficiently, e.g. page 4/5 concerning the sequence similarity. Also on page 14 there is no citation for the statement ?Pim-1 expression is increased under hypoxia in pancreatic cancer cells, independently of HIF-1 α" . Here, some of the statements are quite speculative. Minor comments: 1. HIF-1α is termed hypoxia ?inhibitor" factor, which is uncorrect, it should correctly be hypoxia inducible factor 1α.