

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8823

Title: Operable oesophageal junctional adenocarcinoma: where to next?

Reviewer code: 02510223

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-01-21 09:38

Date reviewed: 2014-01-24 22:25

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for inviting me to review the article entitled " Operable oesophageal junctional adenocarcinoma: where to next?". In this article, the authors explored recent findings relating to the molecular characterisation of oesophagogastric cancer and their impact on therapeutics and discussed efforts to decrease the incidence of junctional adenocarcinoma using early intervention in Barrett's oesophagus. This is a well-written paper containing interesting results which merit publication. I suggest this paper should be accepted.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8823

Title: Operable oesophageal junctional adenocarcinoma: where to next?

Reviewer code: 02462691

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-01-21 09:38

Date reviewed: 2014-01-25 22:50

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review that is concise and well-summarised for the increasing body of literatures available for this topic. One controversy is the classification of junctional adenocarcinoma, whether to place Siewert type II/III into the oesophagus or the stomach, and this will influence the treatment options especially surgical approach. Unfortunately, many trials often include mixture of both sites including the ones mentioned in the review. As such, rather than “operable oesophageal junctional adenocarcinoma...” as the title, maybe “locally advanced gastro-oesophageal junctional adenocarcinoma...” is more appropriate. It is also agreed that due to mutations, therapeutic molecular targets for junctional adenocarcinoma have been difficult to identify but there is hope (Reference Chong IY et al. J Pathol 2013; 231: 301-10). Please explain SURF and also add the relevant reference for this. All please add references for all quoted studies into the table. Do proof-read again since there are a number of minor errors for example in the perioperative chemotherapy section, line 5, “in” was absent before “....patients”.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8823

Title: Operable oesophageal junctional adenocarcinoma: where to next?

Reviewer code: 00039422

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-01-21 09:38

Date reviewed: 2014-01-26 17:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is presented as a systematic review and meta-analysis. Indeed, it does not seem to be a meta-analysis. Moreover, the number of considered papers should be higher considering the amount of literature about this topic. The paper is very confused and not written in a homogenous way. Likely the very poor English does not help. The reported findings in the literature, are not complete, could be much more broadened and are reported in a disordered and not complete way. Most of the described issues are well known, beyond any discussion, while others, like the need for endoscopy in children, are still controversial and should be better proposed. An other example of the insufficiency of the paper is the reported list of the drugs used for the management of caustic injuries, without any comment about the role and the debate of each single class of drugs, like steroids, PPI, antibiotics (When? Why?). Considering the ambitions of the paper, the discussion is too short and the onclusions are confusing. In the present form, the paper is not worth of publication.