

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9679

Title: Gastric cancer: prevention, screening and early diagnosis

Reviewer code: 01003401

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-02-24 13:27

Date reviewed: 2014-03-01 13:39

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review, we can see that the authors try to introduce the prevention, screening and early diagnosis of Gastric cancer. All the author mentioned in the topic is well organized. In the section of prevention, it should be better that the author can add some more on novel gastric therapy like gastric treatment by the nanoparticle with chemotherapeutics. Especially in the third chapter of the prevention in this article you mentioned about targeting signaling pathways activated by H. pylori infection (COX2, EGFR, and VEGFR2 etc.) is among the potential strategies to prevent GC, also we have an article is write about this, I think you can read about it ,the title of our article is "Chemotherapy for gastric cancer by finely tailoring anti-Her2 anchored dual targeting immunomicelles", I think this topic can be cited.

ESPS Peer-review Report**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9679**Title:** Gastric cancer: prevention, screening and early diagnosis**Reviewer code:** 00744476**Science editor:** Yuan Qi**Date sent for review:** 2014-02-24 13:27**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-03 04:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 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 paper is a review article about recent prevention and diagnosis of gastric cancer. This review article is well summarized and this article including data of many trials and studies might be interesting and helpful for gastric cancer field. Hence, I wish to be cited in World Journal of Gastroenterology, although a few modifications are needed as shown below. 1. Page 5, 1st line: "GC may be explained" is better than "GC could be explained" because the effect of ascorbic acid, carotenoid and beta-carotene is limited and inconsistent from the results of clinical trials. 2. Page 17, 1st line: "in" should be removed from the sentence "A large H-Pylori eradication study in is". 3. Page 24, 1st paragraph of Risk stratification: Please describe the definition of high and low grade dysplasia. These would be helpful for the readers.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9679

Title: Gastric cancer: prevention, screening and early diagnosis

Reviewer code: 02537773

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-02-24 13:27

Date reviewed: 2014-03-04 07:18

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The recent review is dedicated to prevention and early detection of gastric cancer. It is well written systematic work that summarizes most recent views on this topic especially to endoscopy. I have only few minor comments to make. 1.Minor Language editing is needed. 2.Micro-RNA should be written as microRNA. 3.The authors may wish to add few introductory words also to different Helicobacter strains and related differences in risk for gastric cancer development. 4.The OLGA/OLGIM section might be extended by few descriptive sentences to introduce potentially unfamiliar readers with the scoring system. 5.The inclusion of a summary/overview figure would provide an additional value to the review.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9679

Title: Gastric cancer: prevention, screening and early diagnosis

Reviewer code: 02537769

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-02-24 13:27

Date reviewed: 2014-03-07 15:36

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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

To authors: The authors Pasechnikov et al. submitted a manuscript describing prevention, detection and early diagnosis of gastric cancer. The subject is appropriate for publication in this journal and generally the manuscript addresses the key points well. However, several major issues should be addressed before this manuscript is acceptable for publication. General comments: Although the subject is appropriate for publication in this journal, parts of the manuscript are poorly written and therefore these parts of the text are incomprehensible. The most critical sections are the Abstract, last two paragraphs of Introduction, and the last paragraph of Primary and secondary prevention. I would suggest thorough revising of the manuscript text with the help of English language editor. The authors are repeating several statements in certain sections of the article, for example, throughout the whole section entitled Chemoprevention, several statements are repeated at least twice. Next, section H. pylori eradication is not clearly written and should/could be shortened in order to present the subject more clearly. I would also suggest the authors to present this subject in a more organized way and, if possible, to shorten this section. Furthermore, since the article is quite long, the clarity would be greatly improved, if the authors summarized key points at the end of each section, explaining key steps or suggest key points that should still be addressed regarding the detection and diagnosis of this type of cancer in order to improve these procedures. For example, a simple explanation (or suggestions based on their literature research) before the Summary or within the Summary text, regarding who to screen and when to screen would improve the article and emphasize the aim of the article. This would also help the reader to quickly access relevant conclusions at the end of the article. Specific comments: 1. Some of the abbreviations are not



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

explained. 2. Some of the abbreviations are first used and then explained later in text (for example, intestinal metaplasia (IM)) or not explained (for example EGD). 3. The meaning of the sentence: "Because the median follow-up period in a retrospective study was 3.0 years, it seems that >5 years follow-up period based on a small sample size and great uncertainty. " is not clear. 4. Micro-RNA is usually written microRNA. 5. In the sentence "In addition to the epidemiology, test accuracy and disease management issues, the accuracy..." I would suggest rephrasing the sentence and using "In addition to" or "Additionally". 7. The authors often use the phrases "This is hardly possible..." or "This should be mentioned...", however, it would be more appropriate to use " It is ... or It should...". 8. The Summary should be rewritten in order to include suggested relevant conclusions regarding all the aspects of better prevention, diagnosis and screening procedures in GC detection, and should not summarize only endoscopic methods.