

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13848

Title: The Prognostic Value of c-MET in Colorectal Cancer: A Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00069379

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-09-04 16:55

Date reviewed: 2014-10-06 04:29

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review of the article entitled "The Prognostic Value of c-MET in Colorectal Cancer: A Meta-analysis"

Dear Author! The original idea of this article is excellent. It is to try to summarize the literature in association with the role of c-Met amplification in metastatic process of CRC. I have just a few problems with this article which are listed below. 1. The paper must be corrected by a native speaker because it contains quite large amount of linguistic problems. Some are listed as follows: 1. Page 1: "metastatic", At the beginning of a sentence sometimes c-Met, sometimes C-MET can be found. With "a" poor prognosis, → with poor prognosis etc. 2. Page 2: There are space problems. "Studies characteristics" → Studies' characteristics, etc. 3. Figure 1. "Recrods" 4. There are a few sentences which are not really correct from a linguistic point of view. For example on page 7. ..." Many factors such as different populations studied, disease stage, the use of varied antibodies for IHC and housekeeping genes for RT-qPCR, clinical treatment and different criteria to stratify c-Met status." 2. The author mentions a subgroup called "Western country". Is he aiming just one country or more? Which country is that? USA, Italy, Greece? 3. At the beginning of this paper the author applies the expression of PFS. Later changes to DFS. It would be suggested to use just one of them, because no explanation of the difference of this two parameter. Could they be the same? 4. In the abstract 1895 included patients are mentioned. On page 6th 2210 included patients are mentioned. Controversial information. 5. There is no conclusion part at the end of this article, but the conclusion in the discussion part is quite poor. The reader wants to get to know some more



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

information of the importance of c-Met analysis. The referred articles surely contain facts of that. What kind of therapeutic target could it be, what would be the suggested chemotherapy for the oncologist in these cases etc. After fixing these minor problems new revision is necessary before acceptance for publication.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13848

Title: The Prognostic Value of c-MET in Colorectal Cancer: A Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 02438889

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-09-04 16:55

Date reviewed: 2014-09-24 01:26

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"/> Existing	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

You should include the details of the statistical analysis and give the p-values in the tables and figures. The paper is not well organized and the result and discussion sections are too short. The figures with the legends are not well explained. Many abbreviations are incomplete; there should be a glossary. Table 1 is badly presented and twisted. Please define what you mean with high versus low c-MET expression. The subgroup analysis is unclear: where are the values for the "western countries"? What is the meaning of NC and ES? The last sentence should read "interpreting" not "interrupting".

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13848

Title: The Prognostic Value of c-MET in Colorectal Cancer: A Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00042186

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-09-04 16:55

Date reviewed: 2014-09-18 15:07

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting meta-analysis on the prognostic value of c-Met in CRC, nevertheless some minor flaws are present. An accurate review by a statistician is mandatory. TABLE 1, Figure 2 and 3: Many of authors' names are not present in the References List please check them. RESULTS: Why did you performed subgroup analysis in studies by Western countries? Did you compare these data with the others studies? DISCUSSION: - TOMOKAZU(10) and ALESSANDRO (13) are not present in the References List please check it. - You performed subgroup analysis in studies by Western countries but you did not comment obtained data in Discussion.