

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8893

Title: Polymorphisms of 5,10-methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase and a negative risk of oesophageal adenocarcinoma in a Caucasian UK population

Reviewer code: 00069819

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 15:54

Date reviewed: 2014-01-11 21:32

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 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)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 case-control study the authors report their interesting results of the risk of esophageal adenocarcinoma in patients with methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase genetic polymorphisms. The manuscript is well written (although it requires some polishing of the English language), and would contribute to our canon of knowledge about this putative cause-effect relationship. However, the following points and suggestions should be kindly noted by the authors: 1. The title should be changed to "Polymorphisms of methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase and susceptibility to oesophageal adenocarcinoma in a Caucasian UK population". 2. The aim of the study should be stated more clearly in the "background" section of the abstract (so it should be "background" and not "introduction") 3. The introduction section is too long. I believe it should be limited to 3-4 short paragraphs only. 4. The discussion section should include a paragraph stating the limitations of the study (e.g. case-control nature of the study, small sample size with the possibility of type 2 statistical error) 5. In the concluding remarks, the authors should suggest some directions for future studies 6. The table appears somehow confusing (I really could not read it easily!). Also, the legend is too long, and I believe that much of this information could be reported in the main text, leaving only the title of the table with the abbreviations as footnote.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8893

Title: Polymorphisms of 5,10-methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase and a negative risk of oesophageal adenocarcinoma in a Caucasian UK population

Reviewer code: 00052396

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 15:54

Date reviewed: 2014-01-13 04:26

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript by Keld et al describes a small-scale study on the relationship between MTHFR polymorphism, folic acid metabolism and oesophageal adenocarcinoma in a Caucasian population. Although some interesting data are presented in the manuscript, this reviewer has two major concerns as follows: 1. Sample size is too small, 50 non-cancer and 48 cancer. This sample size probably would not allow statistically significant conclusions in a gene polymorphism study. Therefore the authors need to tune down statements. 2. Statistical analysis needs to be improved. For example, why use normal, low, high for folate level and vitamin B12 level instead of real values? Four individual and correlated factors (MTHFR polymorphism, folic acid, B12, homocysteine) are associated with clinical diagnosis (non-cancer and cancer) and prognosis (survival time). Potential interactions among these four factors were ignored. A professional biostatistician needs to be consulted.