

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25769

Title: Avoiding Hepatic Metastasis Naturally: Lessons from the Cotton Top Tamarin (Saguinus oedipus)"

Reviewer's code: 01568246

Reviewer's country: Norway

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-03-22 17:43

Date reviewed: 2016-04-06 18:51

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"/> 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 present article is (1) a review of research done with Cotton Top Tamarin (CTT) in order to explain how this New World primate avoids hepatic metastases following colon cancer, and (2) a review entitled "Hypotheses of hepatic metastases in humans?". The Introduction gives a good background for the reader. The aim of the review (part 1) is to compare mechanisms known to induce liver metastases in humans with related processes in the CTT. The authors have focused their review on molecular mechanisms whereby adhesion molecules known to be important in formation of human hepatic metastases act. An early chapter discusses CTT colon cancer biology vis a vis corresponding human disease. Important information is given in Table I. This table is extremely difficult to understand in its present form and should be revised such that the reader really can compare cancer genetics in CTT and human. This chapter also discusses earlier results on chemokins, kallikrein and other relevant molecules. This information is of course essential and should be presented in a more precise way, for instance in a table which shows which relevant factor has been investigated and which has not. CEA has a central position in the research of the authors.

Western blots are shown in Fig 3. Lane 5 shows ?positive CEA control?. The lane shows a value that is very different from the position of CEA at 50. What is the reason for the difference? The chapters ?Definitive studies on the homology of the CEA molecule? and ?Summary: Specific metastasis-targeted studies in CCT and humans? are interesting and respond to the question asked by the authors: ?The only pieces of the puzzle missing were the questions of CEA molecular homology and how to tie the available data together to explain how the CCT dodges liver metastases?. Although more work needs to be done it seems likely that mutations in the N-terminus of the CEA and the reduced binding activity to Kupffer cell receptors may reduce metastases in CTT. Finally: The second half of the article (?Hypotheses of hepatic metastases in humans?) is a well written and excellent review. Possibly. It would conceivably be an advantage for the reader if the second half exchanges place with the first half, then readers without direct experience in the field would be prepared to read about the work done by the authors on Cotton Top Tamarin. Conclusion: The following points need to be dealt with: 1. Chapter: ?CTT colon cancer biology vis a vis human?. Table 1 is unnecessarily complicated and should be revised such that the reader really can see what is compared. 2. All acronymes should be explained in a list. Readers without direct knowledge about the field (colon cancer, metastases, etc) will spend a lot of time to steadily find the meaning of the abbreviations. 3. The review reads well but a few sentences still need to be corrected or revised. 4. Fig 4: Difficult to see bile canaliculus? Fig 5: To compare A and B the magnifications should have been Equal. 5. In order to be prepared to read the review about the work of the authors it would be an advantage to put the present last part of the article in front.