



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20939

**Title:** Role of genetic detection in peritoneal washes with gastric carcinoma: The past, present and future

**Reviewer’s code:** 03270459

**Reviewer’s country:** China

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-27 09:51

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-09 15:34

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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This study investigated the past, present and future of genetic detection in peritoneal washes with gastric carcinoma, which is informative and instructive. The following problems should be solved. Authors should explain clearly the exact dividing line of time about "The past, the present and the future". Abstract: 1. The Abstract section is more like the Introduction. The main contents of this part should be Background, Method, Results and Conclusions, instead of an introduction of this study. 2. "Genetic detection" should be added as a key word. Introduction: The word "Introduction" is wrongly spelled. The present: The use of RT-PCR techniques is directly described. The suggestion is that other techniques presently used for detection of intraperitoneal free cancer cell with gastric carcinoma be introduced to tell the present status. Table 1, I suggest to add Tm(°C) of CK-20. Furthermore, comprehensive analysis of inner associations among the past, the present, the future, could be discussed to elevate research significance.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20939

Title: Role of genetic detection in peritoneal washes with gastric carcinoma: The past, present and future

Reviewer's code: 03001726

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-27 09:51

Date reviewed: 2015-07-10 13:56

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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 review made a conclusion about the conventional cytology and the RT-PCR method to detect intraperitoneal free cancer cells with gastric carcinoma. According to previous and current studies, it also listed and discussed some candidate markers for RT-PCR. Finally, the review pointed out that it should be standardized for the process and method of genetic detection with peritoneal washes, and, diagnostic kits should be developed. Besides, relative modality of treatment should be established. It is quite interesting review about the detection of peritoneal free cancer cells with gastric carcinoma, which provides general overview and makes reasonable suggestions for future. I think that the paper is within the scope of the journal. However, the author needs to address the following points: 1). There should be a clear definition about the time line "the past, the present and the future". 2). In the last part, there should be some discussion about the important issues or difficulties to be addressed for establishment of standard. 3). Because the end of the manuscript seems sudden, there should be a conclusion about this review.