

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11502

Title: Prognostic value of Muc5AC in gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02149062

Reviewer's country: France

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2014-05-24 12:10

Date reviewed: 2015-01-19 19:31

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

Good revision. Can be accepted for publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11502

Title: Prognostic value of Muc5AC in gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02569194

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2014-05-24 12:10

Date reviewed: 2014-07-02 00:57

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 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 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 manuscript is very interesting. The authors made a good meta-analysis about the prognostic value of Muc5AC in gastric cancer. The authors searched the Pubmed and Embase to retrieve eligible studies, and 11 retrospective cohort studies comprising 2135 patients were included to assess the association between Muc5AC expression and overall survival and/or clinicopathological characteristics. They concluded that decreased Muc5AC expression might be a poor prognostic predictor for gastric cancer. The manuscript is very well written. Only some minor revisions needed. 1 This manuscript is a meta-analysis, not a evidence-based medicine article. Please take attention about that. 2 The abstract should re-structured. 3 Some minor language polishing should be corrected. 4 The text need some editing.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11502

Title: Prognostic value of Muc5AC in gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 01752325

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2014-05-24 12:10

Date reviewed: 2015-01-14 09:02

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good manuscript. The authors made a carefully revision. Can be accepted.