



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15359

Title: Alternative splicing of VEGFA, APP and NUMB genes in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 00069105

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-24 10:13

Date reviewed: 2015-01-02 06:10

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

First, congratulations to perform basic science is always complex, difficult and under-recognized. Paper have only one problem the few cases that you have studied I understand that this study s very expensive but you could have severe bias because you include very few cases of each stage and location (rectum vs colon). Only (more or less) 5 cases in each stage. Logically statistical analysis did not get statistical value probably by low number of cases. A table for understanding better results obtained should improved the global understanding of the paper

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15359

Title: Alternative splicing of VEGFA, APP and NUMB genes in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 00068723

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-24 10:13

Date reviewed: 2014-12-26 09:00

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

The authors compared expression levels and alternative splicing of VEGF, APP, and NUMB between CRC and normal tissues. VEGF is popular, but APP and NUMB were unfamiliar. Introduction of APP and NUMB are necessary in Introduction. The reason was lacking why the authors analyzed APP and NUMB in Introduction. The reason is necessary in Introduction why the authors analyzed alternative splicing of VEGF, APP and NUMB. Brief information is necessary regarding biological significance of alternative splicing of VEGF, APP, and NUMB. Description of alternative splicing of VEGF, APP and NUMB in Discussion should be moved to Introduction. Otherwise, readers ended up in reading the manuscript without any information of them. Discussion Discussion should be changed focusing on biological significance of the present data. For example, how did the author speculate up or down-regulation of APP and NUMB? Were there any speculation that VEGFA165b was down-regulated in CRC tissues? What strategy did the authors have regarding "potential targets for the treatment of CRC" regardind VEGF isoforms? Abbreviations should be spelled out when they first appeared in the main text.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15359

Title: Alternative splicing of VEGFA, APP and NUMB genes in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 00068256

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-24 10:13

Date reviewed: 2014-12-26 16:17

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

The authors study the relatives between alternative splicing in VEGFA, APP and NUMB gene and colorectal cancer (CRC). The work is interesting and valuable. However, there are several potential issues needed to be elucidated. 1. Why the authors selected these three genes in the study? 2. At least six splice variants of human VEGF have been reported (VEGF 121,145,165,183,189,206), producing 6 isoforms. Why the author focused on the VEGF165, 121 and 206? 3. The method of RFLP described in the manuscript seems different from the common used assay. Please provide the protocol in detailed. 4. The manuscript is full of typos. 5. The authors performed the correlation ship between these genes/variants and clinical features. However, the case number is small, which discount the reliability and statistical power of their data. They should increase the sample numbers. 6. These figures should be rearranged and reedited. It is better to combine the Fig 4-6 into one new Figure. In addition, the relative size of different panel in a figure is suboptimized.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15359

Title: Alternative splicing of VEGFA, APP and NUMB genes in colorectal cancer

Reviewer’s code: 00070062

Reviewer’s country: Romania

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-24 10:13

Date reviewed: 2015-01-05 20:13

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

This study investigated the alternative splicing in CCR by comparing 20 CCR samples and 20 normal adjacent controls in triplicate and validating by RT-PCR. The study is interesting, but there are several remarks: 1. The samples were provided from 18 cases of resectable patients and 2 metastatic patients, which could influence the results. Please discuss. 2. Taking into consideration that a pathway should be searched, please motivate the choice of the three markers which were used in the study and explain the possible relationship between them. 3. The first paragraph in introduction should have information focused on colorectal cancer and the motivation about the interest of discovering the alternative splicing in this disease.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15359

Title: Alternative splicing of VEGFA, APP and NUMB genes in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 00074751

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-24 10:13

Date reviewed: 2015-01-06 01:04

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 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

In this paper, the author tried to explore the relatives between alternative splicing in VEGFA, APP and NUMB gene and colorectal cancer(CRC). It is a topic of interest to the researchers in the related areas . However, The design seems simple and the evidence is poor. The flowing are the detailed comments.1 The conclusions are overstated, especially based on such a limited sample size. In addition, there is a lack of related literatures to support these points. 2 The experimental methods need to be described specifically. And the electrophoregram about the products of VEGFA, APP and NUMB genes should be provided to proof the conclusions. 3. The author investigated the relationship between the expression of VEGFA, APP and NUMB mRNA with depth of tumor infiltration, the presence of lymph node metastasis and TNM stages, but the explanation of the result is not provided in the discusion.