

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31422

Title: CUL4A associates with epithelial to mesenchymal transition and poor prognosis in perihilar cholangiocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 02462205

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-11-17 17:04

Date reviewed: 2016-11-29 22:35

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 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

Major comments: 1) The paper needs to be revised by an English mother tongue expert. 2) In Material and Methods section the technique of lentivirus transfection must be better explained and the technique of ZEB1 knockdown must be included. Moreover it has to be elucidated if the wound healing assay was conducted in complete medium or in medium deprived of serum. 3) In the results section, in the first paragraph, (line 9), the CULA4 IHC score values should be inverted. 4) In the results section, in the second paragraph, the authors describes the cutoff scores of OS and PFS for high CULA4 expression but figure 2 doesn't show these values that must be added. 5) In the results section, in the third paragraph, the table mentioned (table 2) must be better explained especially for HR and CI. In the same paragraph the number of the figures reported is wrong. 6) In the results section, in the fifth paragraph, the authors describe experiments conducted in QBC939 cells depleted of CULA4 and in FRH0201 cells overexpressing CULA4. The authors should also add results conducted in FRH0201 cells depleted of CULA4 and QBC939 cells overexpressing CULA4. 7) In the discussion section the authors should also discuss the results obtained for vimentin expression.



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>

Minor comments: 1) Reference 6 in the introduction is wrong. 2) In the results section, in the third paragraph, “Moreover high CULA4 expression was correlated with PFS in PHCC patients “ must be changed in “Moreover high CULA4 expression was correlated with lower PFS in PHCC patients “. 3) In the results section, in the fourth paragraph, (Fig 3B down) must be added to the description of the Matrigel assay. 4) In the results section, in the sixth paragraph, punctuation must to be checked.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31422

Title: CUL4A associates with epithelial to mesenchymal transition and poor prognosis in perihilar cholangiocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 00053888

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-11-17 17:04

Date reviewed: 2016-11-18 17:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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 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 authors have put together an excellent paper that is a mix of solid basic science with a clinical correlation. My only slight concern is the number of patients who were censored because they died of 'other causes' it is not made clear how many of these patients existed. There is a huge amount of data presented which makes the paper long and complex. It would almost be better to have two separate papers but published next to one another, however the data presented is very worthy of publication.