

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16204

**Title:** Circulating RNAs as new biomarkers for detecting pancreatic cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 00001832

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-03 17:32

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-03 00:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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

The authors specifically focus on circulating micro RNAs as well as on small non-coding RNAs (ncRNAs) or long ncRNAs. This review contains interesting information and is in general well written. However there are some concerns with the manuscript that should be addressed. The abstract reads more like short introduction section and should be modified to better describe what the authors have analyzed and what they have found during their literature review. The authors should include somewhere the search strategy. As of now is not clear where there was a selective literature search or a systematic search to include all available data especially on circulating RNAs in pancreatic cancer. This information should be provided. As a general comment: Most of the manuscript deals more with aspects of circulating RNAs in cancer in general and not specifically with pancreatic cancer. Altogether it is a nicely written manuscript regarding circulating RNAs and cancer. I would advise the authors to include the search algorithm and to point out whether the data concerning pancreatic cancer are the result of a systematic search or a general search.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16204

**Title:** Circulating RNAs as new biomarkers for detecting pancreatic cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 00227592

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-03 17:32

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-04 08:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 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 checked="" 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

Circulating RNAs have been investigated as potential biomarkers for many cancers including pancreatic cancer. The main purpose of this manuscript was to review circulating RNAs as new biomarkers for detecting pancreatic cancer. However, the authors failed to discuss it in depth.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16204

**Title:** Circulating RNAs as new biomarkers for detecting pancreatic cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 00503512

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-03 17:32

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-04 08:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input 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"/> [Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors of this review article have summarized current knowledge on circulating RNAs in pancreatic cancer. The manuscript is interesting for this Journal and well presented. I would recommend to accept it, pending the following changes: 1) Please carefully revise the writing to ensure that you remain consistent throughout the text: the tense changes too frequently 2) In the section on "other non-coding RNAs" the authors quote snoRNAs, lncRNAs etc but they do not introduce their formal definition. That should be changed 3) in the same section, the authors state that the function of ncRNA is still subject to "many questions". Even if this partially true, the authors should quote some seminal papers that clearly define the functional role of lncRNAs and other RNAs in human cancer and in the human transcriptome (e.g. PMID: 25599403, 25619839, 24346158)

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16204

**Title:** Circulating RNAs as new biomarkers for detecting pancreatic cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 02731744

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-03 17:32

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-04 19:29

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

The authors described the review of RNA circulating RNAs as new biomarkers for detecting Panc Ca. This paper is almost well-written, however, I would recommend some revision before publication. Please describe more discussion section, and more depth. This is important point for our readers.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16204

**Title:** Circulating RNAs as new biomarkers for detecting pancreatic cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 02533276

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-03 17:32

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-11 19:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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 aim of this review is to summarize current knowledge about circulating RNAs in pancreatic cancer focusing specially on the possible clinical use of these RNAs as biomarkers for this cancer. The manuscript is interesting and in general is well written. However, I consider that the following points should be addressed for the authors 1. The abstract should be modified in order to summarize the main points discussed in this review. 2. Authors should focus more specifically on pancreatic cancer and discuss more deeply the possible diagnostic and/or prognostic value of circulating RNAs for this neoplasia. In literature there are other general reviews describing circulating RNAs in cancer. 3. In my opinion, it would be useful for the readers that this review includes a section describing the different types of circulating RNAs 4. Authors should indicate if their own results are included in this review. 5. Some new references should be included, Rachagani S et al, Adv Drug Deliv Rev 2015 Jan;81C:16-33. doi: 10.1016/j.addr.2014.10.020. Epub 2014 Oct 23. Frampton AE et al, Expert Rev Mol Diagn 2014 Apr;14(3):267-71. doi: 10.1586/14737159.2014.893192. Epub 2014 Feb 28.