

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22923

**Title:** MicroRNA in rectal cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 03004127

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-10-04 13:26

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-14 15:04

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 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 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 review is about very interesting topic of miRNA in rectal cancer. The miRNA is very promise candidate of molecular marker for early diagnosis and predictor factors for treatment. But the manuscript needs to be minor revision. 1.Paragraph about the colon and rectal cancer and microRNA tell us some common sense and can be abridged as several sentence to describe some background of the study. 2.The results should be summarize in table and figures to make them more clearly. The manuscript display too much describe and the results too confused. 3.The review is not included into a systematic reviews.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22923

**Title:** MicroRNA in rectal cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 00562236

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-10-04 13:26

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-26 23:37

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

The paper by Gaedcke J et al. is a tentative review on what we know on miRNA and rectal cancer. The topic is important because we are searching new valid prognostic markers. 1. The scenario appears rather confusing. As a whole it seems that there are patches of knowledge, but, according to my opinion, it is impossible to gain useful informations from the current literature. Too many markers and too many variables undermine the strength of the messages reported. As stated by the authors, a clear identification of miRNAs useful for prognostic purposes still failed. 2. The manuscript is not straightforward in some passages, and it needs some work in order to make it clearer. 3. Figure 1 is not easy to understand: it is not clear why only miRNA for not responders are shown (right bottom of the figure) 4. English should be improved.