

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11551

Title: A retrospective, multicenter analysis of the clinicopathologic features of Extra-Gastrointestinal stromal tumor (EGIST)

Reviewer code: 00057665

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-05-31 16:41

Date reviewed: 2014-06-17 03:40

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | 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"/> Existing | <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"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a retrospective analysis of patients with extra-gastrointestinal stromal tumors collected from 7 institutions. It reports results from 51 patients from 7 different institutions. Only 41 were available for follow-up. The relevance of this study is limited by the retrospective nature of the analysis. I don't understand why the authors state that only patients older than 18 were included in the study, since this is a retrospective analysis.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11551

Title: A retrospective, multicenter analysis of the clinicopathologic features of Extra-Gastrointestinal stromal tumor (EGIST)

Reviewer code: 00058401

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-05-31 16:41

Date reviewed: 2014-06-19 18:17

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <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"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations for the quality of the work. I made discordance about terminology.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11551

Title: A retrospective, multicenter analysis of the clinicopathologic features of Extra-Gastrointestinal stromal tumor (EGIST)

Reviewer code: 00503442

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-05-31 16:41

Date reviewed: 2014-06-25 17:38

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | 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"/> Existing | <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"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | | BPG Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with great interest the manuscript entitled "A retrospective, multicenter analysis of the clinicopathologic features of Extra-Gastrointestinal stromal tumor (EGIST)" by Yi et al. The manuscript is well done and well written. The following observations, however, are made: ? In the Abstract section, the Authors should specify the number of institutes involved in the study. ? The series investigated seem too limited (n = 51). ? The Methods employed in the study should be more detailed (i.e. immunohistochemistry and genetic analysis). ? An appropriate paragraph reporting the statistical analysis should be introduced. ? Some orthographical and grammatical errors have been found throughout the manuscript. ? The entire manuscript should be formatted according to the Journal guidelines for Authors.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11551

Title: A retrospective, multicenter analysis of the clinicopathologic features of Extra-Gastrointestinal stromal tumor (EGIST)

Reviewer code: 00055107

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-05-31 16:41

Date reviewed: 2014-06-27 02:10

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | 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"/> Existing | <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"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper analyse several clinicopathologic parameters in patients suffering from extra-gastrointestinal stromal tumors such as location, tumor size, histology and mitotic rate. This work also shows valuable clinical data concerning survival rate using strategies including surgery and treatment with imatinib. However, I consider that the quality of this paper would be improved by the addition of several points. In the abstract there are any data from the immunohistochemical analysis (KIT, CD34 and DOG1) and from the genetic PDGFR α analysis. A brief description of several methods should be included in the Methods section: How the mitotic rate was determined? Several technical data of the immunohistochemical analysis should be included such as the specific antibodies used to detect c-KIT, CD34 and DOG1. A brief technical description of the KIT and PDGFR α gene analysis used to determine exon mutations also should be given in Methods. At the end of the Results section, authors give several p values: "When separating two prognostic factors, mitotic rate higher than 5/HPF showed trend to predict more recurrence (p = .061), but did not reach statistical significance and tumor size > 5.0 cm was not associated with risk of recurrence (p =.866)" What kind of statistical analysis was used to obtain these p values? This should be included in the Methods section. In the next paragraph, the statistical term "CI" should be included in full ("confidence interval") in the text the first time that it appears: "... was 22.7 months (95% CI 7.9 – 37.5) ...". In figure 1, the interval of tumor size from the 18 patients who did not receive adjuvant



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>

imatinib after surgery should be "2.6 – 18.0" and not "2.6 – 318.0" as it is stated in the figure. In the figure 1 legend, several terms should be included in full: "HPF", "OS", "RFS", "PFS" and "CI", as it was given for "N/A".