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

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 9563
Title: Circulating tumor cells in pancreatic cancer patients: Enrichment and cultivation
Reviewer code: 02682191
Science editor: Yuan Qi
Date sent for review: 2014-02-25 09:02
Date reviewed: 2014-03-03 21:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is a good one because it describes a series of pancreatic cancer . however we think that the characteristics of cancer cells are too limited (size,CK and Dapi)It would be great if you are able to add some histological markers of mesenchymal and stemness phenotype because the aggressiveness of pancreatic cancer is often related to EMT. By example cells could be labelled with antibodies anti-mena which has two isoforms Mena epithelial or mena-invasive.The major gap of CTC enrichment is the volume of blood sample,as you know due to the statistic poisson there is false negative results with almost technologies.We think that as soon as a tumor is developing there are CTC.The major point of your paper is the culture of cells. This is really good and you can do many tests for characterisations of these cells . I recommand you to test the Gilupi system to capture cells and compare to your filtration system ,even if Gilupi system is based on EpCam capture.(in the paper ,you can find at Google-Gilupi,for braest cancer they are practictly positive for all patients,due to a very large volume of analyzed blood.Finally you have to introduce the notion that your enrichment step is not at the top and that actually no method represents a gold standart.You must emphazise the progress of the isolated cell cultures.

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

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 9563
Title: Circulating tumor cells in pancreatic cancer patients: Enrichment and cultivation
Reviewer code: 02884433
Science editor: Yuan Qi
Date sent for review: 2014-02-25 09:02
Date reviewed: 2014-03-07 02:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article "Circulating tumor cells in pancreatic cancer patients: enrichment and cultivation" by Bobek et al. is a good paper and provides a size-based method to isolate and culture pancreatic CTCs from clinical blood samples. They evaluated CTCs from blood samples of pancreatic patients (n=24) using a device called MetaCell filters and cell culture. I suggested to accept the paper with several major and minor revisions. The major revisions: 1. The authors did not provide details of the methods of MetaCell filtration or cite any previous related papers. If this is the first paper about MetaCell device, the details of operation should be addressed in the methods. 2. Since the authors cultured CTCs for at least 14 days, they may have missed those CTCs that did not survive the culture. False negatives could be a potential problem and the authors did not address this. 3. There is an Inconsistency in stating their observation of culture of PC CTCs. On one hand, In the abstract, they claimed none of CTC cultures reached confluent. On the other hand, in study highlights (2. What is new here) they claimed that the confluent cell culture has been reached. The minor revisions: 1. The writing is a weakness of this paper. Some of the writing is hard to understand in addition to that the paper has several grammar errors. It should be edited by professional English editors before its publication. 2. "In vitro" should be italicized on pages 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, and 16. 3. In line 2 of page 5, it should be elaborated on how to "avoid false positive results". 4. In line 8 of page 7, does the authors mean "the grade III tumor" rather than "the grade III. Of tumor"? 5. What did the authors mean in "The cytoplasm of CTCs is rather pale than rigid" if they described cytoplasm based on fluorescent staining? 6. Reference #2 on page 12 is not formatted appropriately.