

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23201

**Title:** Esophageal squamous cell cancer in a highly endemic region

**Reviewer's code:** 02446450

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-09 08:30

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-16 22:55

| 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor            |  | <input 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

Study from Zambia investigating risk factors among subjects with oesophageal cancer and comparing to non-cancer controls. Overall I like this study. However, I would like the authors to address/clarify the following: 1. The introduction is too long. Much of the epidemiology could be removed (eg relating to South America - not relevant). 2. It was not until I reached the discussion that I learnt what isoprostanes are. This description and relevance of isoprostanes should be moved to the introduction. 3. Increased urinary isoprostane concentrations were associated with oesophageal cancer; however there is no data to explain whether this association is due to a link with smoking, dietary intake ,etc. This data should be provided. 4. Similarly, are urinary isoprostane values constant and reliable? Are values influenced by starvation for example? Do values increase with stage of disease? Are they linked with prognosis? 5. What do the authors see as the true value of measuring urinary isoprotanes? Screeing?. Detecting early disease? When do values increase - invasive disease, metastatic disease?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23201

**Title:** Esophageal squamous cell cancer in a highly endemic region

**Reviewer's code:** 00505438

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-09 08:30

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-29 14:36

| 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 checked="" 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"/> 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

An interesting study from a developing country looking at factors in development of oesophageal adenocarcinoma and means of measuring oxidative stress as a potential method of categorisation. The background needs some judicious editing with much of the information being repetitive and not really relevant to the paper. Some of the data may be better placed in the discussion where relevant. The 15th period of study has unfortunately only given a limited number of patients but the novelty of the study is such that it is of significant interest.