



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25962

Title: Prediction of lymph node metastasis and sentinel node navigation surgery for patients with early-stage gastric cancer

Reviewer’s code: 00204529

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-03-29 08:08

Date reviewed: 2016-04-13 00:26

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 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"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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 authors have written a thoughtful and comprehensive review of the analysis of predictive factors affecting the incidence of lymph node positivity in early gastric cancer, and what factors increase the risk of positive nodal involvement. The English and typographical errors require some correction. The graphic figures outline a treatment algorithm; this should be more clearly stated in the manuscript text. The summarized literature does not lead to clear treatment guidelines in the text. Specific comments are outlined below: Page 7: Pre and postoperative “values” is a poor choice of phrase. What are “receiver operating characteristics,” this is not defined clearly? It should clearly state that these assessments are done likely in EMR or ESD specimens, or not. Page 7: It states that molecular targeting is being studied, and this is followed by a litany of clinical factors. Light microscopy findings are not typically indicative of a molecular target, and this description should be limited to comments on IHC study of EBV, E-cadherin, and VEGF. The authors need to be careful to specify whether or not the listed factors have been validated in other clinical studies. Page 8: Is there really any utility or easy application of the “metastasis formula?” Any statements here need to



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>

be explained and linked to the Figure graphics with clearly treatment guidelines specified or proposed. Page 9 an on: A clear decision pathway and algorithm needs to be articulated here. Page 10: What is ICG and IREE? Page 13: Conclusion: More clear statements here are made, but again a clear treatment algorithm needs to be articulated or proposed.



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: 25962

Title: Prediction of lymph node metastasis and sentinel node navigation surgery for patients with early-stage gastric cancer

Reviewer's code: 00743258

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-03-29 08:08

Date reviewed: 2016-04-25 17:10

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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

An interesting article in the field. In my opinion it could be published but author should give more complete and detailed explanations about the proposed score and the results of the pilot study to validate it. It would be interesting especially in order to accept the proposed algorithm.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25962

Title: Prediction of lymph node metastasis and sentinel node navigation surgery for patients with early-stage gastric cancer

Reviewer's code: 02941534

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-03-29 08:08

Date reviewed: 2016-04-26 16:01

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT, CONCLUSION. It contains checkboxes for various evaluation criteria like 'Grade A: Excellent', 'Priority publishing', 'Google Search', etc.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is an interesting review article concerning th prediction of lymph node metastasis and sentinel node navigation surgery for patients with early-stage gastric cancer. The authors precisely evaluated most of the literatures and concluded that CG-positive lymphatic basin dissection by SNNS with IREE seems to be an adequate method of lymph node dissection.However, there are some issues to be clarified. 1. In this paper, there are several mistakes of font or grammar. 2. The authors stated the sensitivity and spesificity of SNNS but the authors should mention If the subject is sentinel node positive and the role of either completion lymphadenectomy or observation with nodal ultrasound. 3. In Figure 3 the IRRE should be corrected 4. Is there really the validity of scoring system that mentioned in Figure 2 and 1, it should be clearly stated and explained with statistical approach. 5. In page 7, "study showed that the 44 sensitivity and specificity rates were 70% and 61.6%, respectively [28]." The 44?