

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15334

Title: MicroRNA-124 (miR-124) inhibits Cell Proliferation, Metastasis and invasion in Colorectal Cancer by Downregulating ROCK1.

Reviewer's code: 00070916

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-11-23 13:51

Date reviewed: 2014-12-02 01:59

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

In their manuscript "MicroRNA-124 (miR-124) inhibits Cell Proliferation, Metastasis and invasion in Colorectal Cancer by Downregulating ROCK1", Xi et al. aim to analyze the role of miR-124 in the pathogenesis of CRC. The language is overall very poor with additionally a massive amount of small mistakes in typing, grammar and style. This manuscript has to be seen by an editing service at best and by a native speaker of English at the very least. It is sad that many authors try to load this burden onto the shoulders of reviewers – we all have enough to do with our own manuscripts in this respect. In the case of the current manuscript, I refuse to perform a "final" review until the language is acceptable. However, some issues will be addressed as follows in order to give these authors some positive feed-back thus helping them to send a substantially improved revision for re-reviewing: ? Please provide the number of the ethics committee approval. ? What means "UVP software"? ? In the results part, the sentence "Similarly, there was a no difference in the level of ROCK1mRNA between the CRC tissues and the metastatic CRC cases compared to the normal tissues and non-metastatic CRC tissues(P>0.05)(Fig. 1F, G and H)." is not understandable. ? Overall, the data of the authors

would substantially be improved, when data of miR-124 and ROCK1 expression in CRC metastases would be provided. ? Similarly, basic molecular-characterization data for the tumors analyzed must be provided (i.e. which molecular subtype of CRC). Of course, this must also be correlated with the expression data of miRNA-124 and ROCK1). ? Fig. 1A shows a few examples of CRC cases – was this analysis performed for all 68 pairs? This would be a strong argument – please provide these data. ? Please provide real numbers for “age” in Table 1. ? All functional data have been provided for HCT116 only – please add data for at least two cell lines with a different molecular type; i.e. chromosomally-unstable and CpG-island methylator-phenotype (since HCT116 is a classical microsatellite-unstable cell line). ? Reduce redundancies between the introduction part and the discussion. ? What studies are the authors referring to in the discussion “...together with our correlative results in previous clinical studies on miR-124 and ROCK1...”?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15334

Title: MicroRNA-124 (miR-124) inhibits Cell Proliferation, Metastasis and invasion in Colorectal Cancer by Downregulating ROCK1.

Reviewer's code: 00042043

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-11-23 13:51

Date reviewed: 2014-12-18 15:41

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 checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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 manuscript is an interesting work about a potential linkage between mir124 and ROCK. Although the overall quality is good there are a number of comments. In the title the authors state an inhibition of metastasis, but this is only investigated by clinical correlation which seems to be weak evidence. Experimental design: Which controls have been used for normalization? Were mimics and inhibitors commercially available; if yes indicate the provider, if not indicate the details of construction In all "statistical histograms" the standard deviation appears to be extremely low. Just by comparing the variability of the shown western blots it is difficult to believe such very high reproducibility of the results. Are the technical replicates of the same preparations or independent replicates? How many replicated were done in all experiments? Minor comments: "GC cells" should be explained at first usage The stars in all figures for significance are very difficult to see and should be optimized Figure 4 a is not readable an can be ommited A number of spelling mistakes needs to be corrected

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15334

Title: MicroRNA-124 (miR-124) inhibits Cell Proliferation, Metastasis and invasion in Colorectal Cancer by Downregulating ROCK1.

Reviewer's code: 00041966

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-11-23 13:51

Date reviewed: 2014-12-04 22:22

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors studied "in vitro" the expression of miRNA-124 and ROCK1 in colorectal cancer specimens and in normal colorectal cells and the mutual relationship between the two. This interesting paper is very long, mainly due to repetitions in the Introduction (lines 15-20) and Discussion sections that could be avoided. Other comments: Introduction: explain GC and LN the first time they are mentioned Mat. & Met.: the characteristics of the patients from which the specimens were taken should be presented (number, sex, median age, n of colon and rectal cancers....) Results: Lymph nodes metastasis are not reported in the table, as is Duke's stage. Moreover employing both TNM and Duke's staging system could be confusing, it would be better to choose one and I would suggest the TNM. The Authors state that they investigated miRN-124 in 68 specimens but they not specify if the same specimens were used to evaluate ROCK1. Several part of the Results should be moved to Mat. & Met. in particular of the paragraph: Knockdown of miR-124 gene induce cell proliferation, and miR-124 inhibited metastasis , invasion and clonogenic survival of CRC cells