

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28639

**Title:** Elevated fibrinogen plasma level is not an independent predictor of poor prognosis in a large cohort of Western patients undergoing surgery for colorectal cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 00503512

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-12 17:49

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-12 22:12

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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

This retrospective study investigates the role of fibrinogen as a prognostic biomarker in colorectal cancer. The study is well written and tries to shed new light on an extensively studied biomarkers, even though the results are not conclusive. Before publication, I suggest the following amendments: 1) Please specify a protocol (or ID) number for the Ethics Committee approval 2) Table 1 (and 3): have the authors corrected for multiple tests? If so, please specify. If not, please justify why. 3) Discussion. The authors should confront their findings with a larger meta-analysis, which has been recently published (PMID <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26604093>) Why do they think their results are different?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28639

**Title:** Elevated fibrinogen plasma level is not an independent predictor of poor prognosis in a large cohort of Western patients undergoing surgery for colorectal cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 00009776

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-12 17:49

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-25 12:03

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

This paper tried to elucidate role of fibrinogen plasma level in the prediction of CRC prognosis. The manuscript is well written and the data and table is clear. However, I think they should have an exclusion criteria. those patients with unresected tumor and those underwent urgent operations seems not proper for this study. Another issue is that the minimum follow up period is 30 months, but they analysed the 5-year OS, I wonder how many cases were available for the study.