

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6307

**Title:** Controversies in the Pathological Assessment of Colorectal Cancer

**Reviewer code:** 00004093

**Science editor:** Ma, Ya-Juan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-14 18:17

**Date reviewed:** 2013-10-18 18:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 good review. I request the authors to discuss (maybe by adding just a few more sentences) a rapidly increasing role of molecular pathology assessment (which is now a part of pathology assessment) in clinical practice and epidemiology; for both clinics and epidemiology, please discuss a recent study by X Liao et al. N Engl J Med 2012. Please also refer to molecular biomarker guidelines by NCCN (P Febbo et al. JNCCN 2011).

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6307

**Title:** Controversies in the Pathological Assessment of Colorectal Cancer

**Reviewer code:** 00058510

**Science editor:** Ma, Ya-Juan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-14 18:17

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-02 00:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written, informed and comprehensive paper on an important area. The photographs and references are very good. Minor amendmenst are recommended in the section on peritoneal involvement to reflect that UK pathologist continue to use TNM 5,s othis use of TNM 7 for T4a and T4b needs to be stipulated as these are different in TNM 5. The changes in relation to tumour deposits are discussed in detail but this is omitted in the peritoneal section. The title of "Controversies in" negates the need to be all encompassing, but I wonder if a short section/analysis on perineural invasion would be relevent in such a valuable reference paper. The other obvious controversy worth considering would be the issue of lymph node sampling, clearing, numbers etc but this would expand the paper significantly.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6307

**Title:** Controversies in the Pathological Assessment of Colorectal Cancer

**Reviewer code:** 00037998

**Science editor:** Ma, Ya-Juan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-14 18:17

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-11 08:22

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this article, the authors reviewed the factors having important impact on the prognosis of colorectal cancer (CRC) patients, possibly on the current pathology assessment of CRC. They asserted that analysing factors such as tumor deposits, tumor grade, tumor budding, vascular invasion and tumor regression grade would contribute to the existing pathology assessment system although the current tumor-node-metastasis (TNM) staging system had been playing essential role in patient management, therapeutic decision-making and predicting prognosis, and that the controversies in CRC pathology reporting due to subjective nature of some assessments and lack of reproducibility urged the need for developing standardized protocols and reporting systems. The authors collected and analysed data from large numbers of research groups. The review provided useful information to help pathologists and clinician in CRC assessment and treatment. Some minor concerns: Some abbreviations such as TNM, AJCC, RCPATH should be defined in the articles where they first appeared.