

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11936

Title: Identification of candidate colorectal cancer predisposing gene variants in Chinese early onset and familial cases using whole-exome sequencing

Reviewer code: 02905032

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-06-13 12:39

Date reviewed: 2014-06-30 21:32

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"/> 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	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

Zhang and colleagues investigated the efficiency of whole-exome sequencing in identifying known or novel CRC predisposing genes in early-onset or familial CRC cases. This is a well written paper that has been performed stringently. Although the number of included patients is very low, the authors present very interesting results with a straight forward conclusion. However, there are some minor revision to perform before the manuscript is acceptable for publication: 1. Abstract: In the results section the authors have to cancel "previously" when they talk about unreported, or does it mean "previously reported". I guess this has to be a mistake since they put previously before "unreported?! 2. The authors have to explain why they defined early onset CRC patients to be < 40 years. Other authors set the age at <50 years. A citation would be mandatory. 3. Page 9, line 15, Results section: change " patients was female" into "patients were female". Grammatically correct would be the plural. 4. Page 11, line 21: "variants to be damaging or possibly/probably damaging"-I would recommend to use the term "functionally altered or impaired" instead of damaging. 5. Figures 1-3: Increase the size of the letters within the Figures. They are very small and might become unreadable in the final print or pdf version 6. Table 4 and 5: I strongly recommend to remove the question mark in these table. Instead, use an abbreviation for splice site mutation (i.e. ssm). This sounds more scientific 7. There are some problems with the line spaces throughout some tables (i.e. table 3: line: "Validated by Sanger sequencing" is missing the word "genes". Please reformat/resize the tables otherwise



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>

important information might be missing in the final version.