

# ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9577

**Title:** Abnormal  $\beta$ -catenin immunohistochemical expression as a prognostic factor in gastric cancer: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02456472

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2014-02-18 20:38

**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-01 21:48

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors chose a significant topic in clinics, and used the method of meta-analysis to evaluate the effect of  $\beta$ -catenin immunohistochemical expression in the prognosis of gastric cancer. However, lots of drawbacks appeared in the manuscript.

**Literature Search** The search terms were not complete, such as "stomach cancer/ carcinoma/ neoplasm/tumor" were not included. In addition, whether free text and MeSH search for keywords were employed?

**2. Data extraction and assessment** What are the content of "the Newcastle–Ottawa quality assessment scale" Each item of it and the responded score should be listed.

**Statistical analysis** (1) Which statistical model was used, free or fixed model? (2) What is the threshold of heterogeneity test,  $P < 0.05$  or  $P < 0.1$ ?

**4. Discussion** The authors did not explain the results very clearly, and did not compare with the results of other studies. Such as "abnormal  $\beta$ -catenin expressions were correlated with and clinicopathological features including Lauren classification, lymph node metastasis, distant metastasis, but not TNM stage". The authors should explain the negative results, too.

**Figures and tables** Figure 1, the number is nor correct, please check it. Tables, please add some notes to make them be understood easier.

**6. Some places of the article were hard to understand, which need to be revised.**



## 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:** 9577

**Title:** Abnormal  $\beta$ -catenin immunohistochemical expression as a prognostic factor in gastric cancer: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00504161

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2014-02-18 20:38

**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-03 17:28

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" 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

The manuscript is interesting, but needs an accurate language revision. Page 3 - the acronym Wnt should be define.