

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8125

Title: PROGNOSTIC AND PREDICTIVE RESPONSE FACTORS IN COLORECTAL CANCER PATIENTS: BETWEEN HOPE AND REALITY.

Reviewer code: 00000774

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2013-12-18 11:13

Date reviewed: 2014-02-10 17:59

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

This review article comprehensively explored clinical and biological factors associated with prognosis of colorectal cancer patients. Although a wide range of aspects were included, the text was too long and confusing due to continuous descriptions without appropriate separations by chaptering or making subtitles and paragraphs. In addition, the order of constitutions written in the text was not reasonable and the implications were difficult to follow for readers. Chapters, subtitles and paragraphs should be made more frequently and reasonably, and the constitutions of the text should be made more easily understandable. Moreover, there were several grammatical mistakes and unclear sentences, and inappropriate constitutions. For example, page 5, para 4 appeared to be inappropriately inserted between para 3 and 5. The sentence in page 8, para 2, line2 was grammatically incorrect. 'health' in page 15, line6 and 'thirty-tree7 in page 16, line 1 may be mistypes. There were more mistakes and authors should read over the text carefully and rewrite words and sentences. Reference list was incomplete and several papers were cited in the text without listing in the reference list.

ESPS Peer-review Report**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8125**Title:** PROGNOSTIC AND PREDICTIVE RESPONSE FACTORS IN COLORECTAL CANCER PATIENTS: BETWEEN HOPE AND REALITY.**Reviewer code:** 02773843**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-18 11:13**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-22 22:14

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	BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

In manuscript "PROGNOSTIC AND PREDICTIVE RESPONSE FACTORS IN COLORECTAL CANCER PATIENTS: BETWEEN HOPE AND REALITY", the authors review the role of prognostic factors and predictive factors such as CEA, CA19-9, KRAS, HER2 et al. There is no way to summarize a key prognostic factor or predictive factor for CRC therapy because of the complexity of occurrence of cancer and also the cross talk among different signal pathway. But it is necessary to show what factors are high or low due to overexpress or mutation to give a clue for therapy and drug discovery. It is imperfect for this manuscript that the authors don't have a table summarization for CRC relevant factors. It is convenient for reading if the authors make such a table.

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

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8125

Title: PROGNOSTIC AND PREDICTIVE RESPONSE FACTORS IN COLORECTAL CANCER PATIENTS: BETWEEN HOPE AND REALITY.

Reviewer code: 02440941

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2013-12-18 11:13

Date reviewed: 2014-02-23 03:05

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Some changes should be taken on account, mainly according with two aspects: - The content of the abstract is almost the same as the initial part of the manuscript. In my opinion, redaction of the abstract should be at least different, and may content a summary of the whole text. - The first part of the manuscript (clinical prognostic factors) also contain some blood-assays, and also Kras. In my opinion, it could be better to define it as clinical and analytical e.g. and the part of kras include in the final part (molecular prognosis and predictive markers). Other aspects should be reviewed, as abbreviations used all along the text, or all the references may be indicate within the text (e.g. page 5, the study of kras does not have any reference...)

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8125

Title: PROGNOSTIC AND PREDICTIVE RESPONSE FACTORS IN COLORECTAL CANCER PATIENTS: BETWEEN HOPE AND REALITY.

Reviewer code: 00504445

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2013-12-18 11:13

Date reviewed: 2014-02-26 13:07

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the present review of Divitis et al., the authors presented the prognostic and predictive response factors in colorectal cancer. The content of this paper is unique and important. The content of this paper is unique and important. However, I think this paper has some problems to be published. 1. The section "Molecular prognostic and predictive markers" is too long and include various contents. The authors had better divide it into some sections such as KRAS, NRAS/BRAF and PTEN. 2. There are various published clinical studies about KRAS. I think a table about this is useful for understanding of readers.