

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9766

**Title:** S-1 Based Versus Non-S-1 Based Chemotherapy as First Line Treatment of Advanced Gastric Cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00069946

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

**Date sent for review:** 2014-02-27 13:26

**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-17 13:57

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

REMS#:MS Number: -2014-9766 Title: "S-1 Based Versus Non-S-1 Based Chemotherapy as First Line Treatment of Advanced Gastric Cancer: A meta-analysis" by Chunni Xu et al. Reviewer Comments: The authors have performed this meta-analysis assessed the efficacy and tolerability of S-1-based versus non-S-1-based chemotherapy in AGC to assess the best standard chemotherapy regimen of advanced gastric cancer. Seven randomized controlled trials concerning 2176 patients were enrolled in this meta-analysis. Compared to non-S-1 based regimens, the use of S-1 based regimens was associated with an increase of ORR (Risk Ratio (RR) = 1.300, 95%CI: 1.028-1.645), OS (hazard ratio (HR) = 0.89, 95%CI: 0.81- 0.99, p = 0.025), TTF (HR = 0.83, 95%CI: 0.75-0.92, p = 0.000), and a lower risk of febrile neutropenia (RR = 0.225, p = 0.000) and stomatitis (RR = 0.230, p = 0.032). In the subgroup analysis, statistically significant increase in ORR, OS and TTF was found when S-1 based chemotherapy was compared to 5-FU based chemotherapy. And the incidence of leukopenia and stomatitis appears to be higher in 5-FU based arm. Also, S-1 based regimens had no advantage in ORR, OS, PFS, TTF and grade 3 or 4 adverse events over Capecitabine based regimens. In conclusion, as its longer survival time, better tolerance and more convenient use, S-1 based chemotherapy may be a good choice for AGC. More large scale randomized controlled trials is necessary to be carried out and confirm the findings. This manuscript shows that S-1 based chemotherapy as first line treatment of advanced gastric cancers. Manuscripts are well written and shows significant novel findings. Indeed, this manuscript indicates the important characteristics of S-1 based chemotherapy, but several critical points should be examined and manuscript should be revised. The critical comments are as followings; Specific comments: 1. There is no page



## **Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**

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

---

number at the bottoms each page. Authors should describe them in the manuscripts. 2. Is there any additional effect of 2nd or 3rd line chemotherapy after S-1 based first line chemotherapy? Author should add additional data and consideration, if possible. 3. Is there any reports concerning to the incidence of race-specific adverse effect by S1 and capecitabine reported bibliographic?

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9766

**Title:** S-1 Based Versus Non-S-1 Based Chemotherapy as First Line Treatment of Advanced Gastric Cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02534293

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

**Date sent for review:** 2014-02-27 13:26

**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-18 15:35

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Xu and colleagues provide a valuable meta-analysis result, offering suggestions for the S-1 based chemotherapy as a good choice for gastric cancer. Data selection and statistical method is considered as appropriate. My questions and suggestions are as follows: 1. Funnel plot in Figure 2 is for judgment of publication bias. However, in result section, Figure 2 is described as for heterogeneity. Explanation of Figure 2 needs to be revised. 2. Correction of some wrong spelling is needed. 3. It seems to be better to add citation of reference in table 1.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9766

**Title:** S-1 Based Versus Non-S-1 Based Chemotherapy as First Line Treatment of Advanced Gastric Cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00531973

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

**Date sent for review:** 2014-02-27 13:26

**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-21 01:06

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

The authors meta-analyzed 7 phase III trials and 2176 AGC pts and compared S-1 based Vs non-S1, concluding that the use of S-1 was associated with an advantage in terms of ORR, OS, TTF and haematological toxicities when S-1 was compared to 5-FU-based chemotherapy. Furthermore, S-1-based regimens had no advantage in ORR, OS, PFS, TTF, and AEs over Capecitabine based regimens. The work is well written and interesting because it focuses attention on a controversial issue in the treatment of AGC, but the authors should stress more clearly that these results are true especially in the Asian population, and should explain why. Minor revision are needed. Finally, the authors could add in the reference section the review of Oditura et al published a month ago in WJG