

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15244

**Title:** Comparison of clinicopathologic findings, molecular pathology and prognosis between young and old gastric cancer patients

**Reviewer's code:** 02941534

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-18 12:03

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-08 17:48

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		<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1- This is a very unusual study aimed to investigate the effect of clinicopathological and molecular characteristics of gastric cancer according to the age. 2- A flow chart or consort diagram of the excluded 758 patients will be helpful. 3- The primary outcome was given as mortality and recurrence of gastric cancer; but this is a retrospective study, thus besides giving primary outcome the authors should mention as; the primary aim of this study is to compare the survival effect of... should be better to define the study. 4- A higher rate of palliative resection was performed in young patients and previous studies showed that palliative gastrectomy can improve survival. More gastrectomy in young group may affect survival rate as found in univariate analyses. More details about the effect of gastrectomy on survival should be mentioned in discussion section. 5- Higher rate of Chemotherapy was used in young group but we know that different subgroups of chemotherapeutics can affect survival. Additionally if the authors did not have this data, it should be mentioned as limitation. 6- The manuscript should be reviewed for English translation again.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15244

**Title:** Comparison of clinicopathologic findings, molecular pathology and prognosis between young and old gastric cancer patients

**Reviewer's code:** 03017825

**Reviewer's country:** Chile

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-18 12:03

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-03 09:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> 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

This is a very interesting article that discusses a little population studied in gastric cancer where was observed an increase in the disease especially in the West. A population of a considerable volume center was analyzed, complementing clinical aspects with molecular variables and even preneoplastic lesions.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15244

**Title:** Comparison of clinicopathologic findings, molecular pathology and prognosis between young and old gastric cancer patients

**Reviewer's code:** 00045952

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-18 12:03

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-01 06:30

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

It is a retrospective, cohort study to compare characteristics and the prognosis of gastric cancer according to age. They analyzed not only clinical and pathological features, but also molecular characteristics between the young and old groups. In my opinion, these findings have a high impact in clinical practice. The manuscript's presentation is of high quality and very readable. The titles reflect the major topic and content of the study. I think the material and methods are sufficiently described - the study type and design is defined, and all simple subsets are detailed. The conclusions drawn are appropriately supported by the literature. The section describes findings based on systematic theoretical analyses of the results and provides valuable conclusions. In addition, the references are appropriate. Minor comments: They should highlight the differences of molecular pathology and pre-cancerous lesions between young and old cancer patients. The sample size isn't well defined - they should review why they excluded such patients in the study (and not just include it in the abstract). The manuscript should be reviewed by an English translator.