

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 18514

**Title:** Complete radiotherapy response in rectal cancer: a review of the evidence

**Reviewer's code:** 02445553

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-04-23 15:52

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-13 14:07

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 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

1. The cited figure of 16-27% cPR is too optimistic. It should be noted that lower figures occur, especially when treating locally advanced rectal cancer. See, cite and include Gerard JP, et al. Radiotherapy Oncol 2015;115:246-52 among the references. 2. To balance the conclusions in the article, it should be mentioned that chemotherapy is risky with morbidity and even mortality. See report from the CARTS study, BJS June 2015. 3. The Habr-Gama studies are not population based and suffer from unclear selection, which may explain some of the very favourable results, and this must be noted in the paper. Details: 4. DRE - Digital Rectal Examination - should be written in full text first time it appears. 5. Consensuses, spelled differently...



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 18514

**Title:** Complete radiotherapy response in rectal cancer: a review of the evidence

**Reviewer's code:** 02551224

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-04-23 15:52

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-14 16:42

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

I wish to congratulate you on your short but well centered review on the evidence supporting conservative treatment after complete response to CRT in rectal cancer. I make only two observations: I found not well specified which type of CRT protocol was used in the different clinical studies reported; There are not indications on evidence based criteria supporting the results of these clinical studies. I understand that there are not RCT on the subject so far, but I think it would be better to analyse which studies are better performed and so more reliable.