

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5820

Title: Colorectal cancer biomarkers: to be or not to be? Cautionary tales from a road well travelled

Reviewer code: 02511983

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-27 11:49

Date reviewed: 2013-10-07 22:12

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 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	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	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

Very small interventions are required for language. Use dots in common abbreviations, for instance i.e instead of ie, vs. for vs

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5820

Title: Colorectal cancer biomarkers: to be or not to be? Cautionary tales from a road well travelled

Reviewer code: 00181023

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-27 11:49

Date reviewed: 2013-10-25 20:19

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 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 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

The manuscript by Fung et al. is a well written and carefully prepared review on the problems that arise with biomarker studies in human subjects. Specifically, three topics are covered: (i) biomarker stability under different storage conditions, (ii) cohort composition and controls, and (iii) analytical variables associated with commercially available reagents. The authors focus on their own area of expertise, IGFBP2, and also MMP9. I have one major concern (though I know that this is an invited review and authors were more or less free to decide what they write about): Is this review really interesting to the readers of the World Journal of Gastroenterology? There is "colorectal cancer" in the title, but does this review really deal with colorectal cancer? A "topic highlight" is a collection of different clinically interesting and relevant papers focusing on a specific topic, here colorectal cancer. Thus, I would expect more information on the current status of biomarkers in the early detection (or perhaps even follow-up) of colorectal cancers: shall we use them and if so, which biomarkers shall we use; you talk about 30 FDA-approved biomarkers, but you do not mention them, which are relevant for CRC? What are their pros and cons, sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV etc. Thus, I am a bit disappointed that the review, in its present form, is more or less technical, thereby "bypassing" the interests of the readers of the journal. But as the review is currently rather short and does only include about 50% of the number of references that should be included and discussed in a "topic highlight", I believe that there is enough space and the authors can add some more "state of the art" information on the value of biomarkers in CRC. One very small minor comment: You introduce the abbreviation CRC in the abstract, but this abbreviation has to be introduced also in the body of the text, i.e. in the first sentence of the introduction.