

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15028

**Title:** Methyl-methanesulfonate sensitivity 19 expression is associated with metastasis and chemoradiotherapy response in esophageal cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 02978590

**Reviewer's country:** Sweden

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-05 13:56

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-16 20:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is basically an interesting paper assessing a novel prognostic biomarker in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma with some potential to open up new lines of research. I do however have some concerns regarding methodology and presentation. 1. The exact recruitment criteria used for control selection is unclearly stated. Was normal esophageal control biopsies obtained from cancer patients' esophagus (which is partly implied) or from other patients? 2. Has the employed method of detecting and quantifying MMS19 been validated with some other method? Please give reference. Moreover the composite score used for quantification seems to have been constructed by the authors. Has it been validated? If not, please discuss this in a clearer way. 3. In Table 1 quantification of MMS19 expression using the 12-grade composite scale is only showed categorized as high and low expression. Please show actual score for each category. 4. In the results section as well as in the tables 1 and 2 it is not at all clear whether the tumor tissue used is from endoscopic biopsies or from operative specimens. Please clarify this. 5. Why was the cut-off level for age chosen to be 55 years? 6. Language is substandard. Please let native English speaker revise manuscript.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15028

**Title:** Methyl-methanesulfonate sensitivity 19 expression is associated with metastasis and chemoradiotherapy response in esophageal cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 02980835

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-05 13:56

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-20 22:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

accept

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15028

**Title:** Methyl-methanesulfonate sensitivity 19 expression is associated with metastasis and chemoradiotherapy response in esophageal cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 02446765

**Reviewer's country:** South Korea

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-05 13:56

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-21 15:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major comments; 1. Results are quite confused. The authors concluded that MMS19 expression is associated with metastasis and good chemotherapy response. However, classification of response to chemotherapy has not been clearly defined and only 29 and 20 patients were enrolled in good response group and poor response group. Please describe more precisely about the definition. 2. Only immunohistochemical staining was performed to evaluate the expression of MMS19. Inter-observer variation is quite common with this method. How did the authors try to overcome this limitation? minor comments; 1. Please describe full terms of each abbreviations below tables.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15028

**Title:** Methyl-methanesulfonate sensitivity 19 expression is associated with metastasis and chemoradiotherapy response in esophageal cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 01544019

**Reviewer's country:** South Korea

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-05 13:56

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-18 11:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study was to investigate clinical significance of immunohistochemical experience of MMS19 in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. The quality of this manuscript's presentation is good and the results of this study provided sufficient experimental evidence.