



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20219

**Title:** Molecular detection of pancreatic neoplasia: current status and future promise

**Reviewer’s code:** 00224612

**Reviewer’s country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-03 18:39

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-04 02:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google 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		<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 manuscript by Majumder and co-workers is a well written, up-to-date and in-depth review regarding molecular detection of pancreatic neoplasia. There are only some minor comments/suggestions: ? Table 1 displays a selection of biomarkers analyzed in pancreatic cancer/diseases. Could the authors state how these markers were selected, e.g. most common, most interesting, etc.? ? The authors state that “CA 19-9 is an approved biomarker for tumor detection in PDAC”. CA 19-9 might be useful for follow-up or as a prognostic marker; however it has in general failed as a detection -in the sense of diagnostic & screening- tool. ? The authors might want to include a short paragraph regarding uniform requirements for biomarker research, which is important for future research with an increasing number of candidate markers.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20219

**Title:** Molecular detection of pancreatic neoplasia: current status and future promise

**Reviewer's code:** 02148395

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-03 18:39

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-10 05:30

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

The review "Molecular detection of pancreatic neoplasia: current status and future promise" by S. Majumder et al. is concerned about early detection of pancreatic cancer by molecular markers defined by new approaches and highlight promising preliminary results. In the Introduction they point out the high mortality rate due to late diagnosis. They proceed with biological considerations they point out the important facts that PDAC is not rapidly progressing and that cystic lesions not necessarily progress to cancer. Turning into the main subject the authors list the molecular markers in different biological samples that may improve PDAC diagnosis in the future. In the blood, from more recently describes protein markers only S100P seems to hold promise. At the DNA level, mutations of KRAS, TP54, SMAD4 and CDKNZY keep holding promise, but further technical improvements are required for approaching blood sample diagnosis. The same accounts for aberrant methylation. The authors then turn to miRNA, but do not discriminate between free and vesicular miRNA. Circulating tumor cells may hold promise particularly for recurrence. In the following the authors turn to tissue/cyst testing, where they focus on cysts as the more relevant tissue for early diagnosis. At present, meaningful progress awaits further studies. For pancreatic juice testing the authors expect further



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

improvement by optimizing marker selection. Studies to diagnose PDAC in stool samples obviously have not yet progressed to allow for possible validity. In concern about future challenges, metabolic profiling, fucosylation and cytokines may be promising. The authors conclude that promising new markers were described, for all of which validation studies have not yet been performed. This is a small review on the current state of an expanded panel of markers for early PDAC detection. It is well written and covers to my knowledge the available information. It may be particularly helpful for clinicians to design the required validation studies. Minor point: The section on serum miRNA should include a differentiation between free and vesicular miRNA as the latter may be more reliable.