

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3512

Title: Small Bowel Carcinoid: Location Isn't Everything!

Reviewer code: 02520219

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-05-06 14:01

Date reviewed: 2013-05-07 22:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Most carcinoids are asymptomatic and difficult to be diagnosed. Thus, it is a tough challenge for carcinoid treatment. Surgery is not curable and traditional chemo-/radio-therapy has limited effects while carcinoid tumors have metastasized. This ms provides a lot good information via statistical analysis. For readers to easily read through and understand, there are some suggestion: 1, in the Section "RESULTS", it is better for authors to describe more detail 2, authors should explain the special words such as T-stage, M-stage, T1,T2 etc. 3, in Table 4, what does "Hazard Ratio" ? and how to calculate?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3512

Title: Small Bowel Carcinoid: Location Isn't Everything!

Reviewer code: 02445430

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-05-06 14:01

Date reviewed: 2013-05-15 15:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is a retrospective analysis of small bowel carcinoids obtained from the SEER database. The paper is clear and easy to follow, its methods clearly stated and the results extremely clear. The discussion is perfectly in line with the results obtained from the statistical analysis, and the Authors also very clearly express and motivates the limits of their retrospective results. The references are up-to-date and appropriate, as well as the figures and tables. The length of the manuscript is also appropriate. This paper is, in my opinion, ready for publication in its present form.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3512

Title: Small Bowel Carcinoid: Location Isn't Everything!

Reviewer code: 02445558

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-05-06 14:01

Date reviewed: 2013-05-19 04:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study population from a National registry is large but there is a large discrepancy between the duodenal and ileo-jejunal carcinoids in terms of staging, intervention and histology of local nodes. As a result, not surprisingly the OS and DS is significantly better for the duodenal carcinoids but the subsequent multivariable analysis fails to confirm a favourable prognostic significance for the duodenal origin. Although this is not a case cohort study, the substantial difference between the duodenal and ileo-jejunal tumours makes difficult the interpretation of the cox regression analysis, somehow surprising as it fails to support data from previous studies. The analysis of the two groups, once they have been matched for stage, extent of surgical intervention and lymphnode histology/yelding, would provide a better and more meaningful study.