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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells
ESPS manuscript NO: 27458
Title: Gene expression and pathway analysis of CTNNB1 in cancer and stem cells
Reviewer's code: 00203307
Reviewer's country: Singapore
Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong
Date sent for review: 2016-06-03 10:02
Date reviewed: 2016-06-12 03:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present evidence that the CTNNB1 gene was up-regulated in gastric cancer cells compared to mesenchymal stem cells. Analysis of the network of associated genes indicated that CTNNB1 plays an important role in the regulation of stem cell pluripotency and cancer signaling. Minor comments: The text wrapping and alignment in the tables requires attention.

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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells
ESPS manuscript NO: 27458
Title: Gene expression and pathway analysis of CTNNB1 in cancer and stem cells
Reviewer's code: 02446120
Reviewer's country: Argentina
Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong
Date sent for review: 2016-06-03 10:02
Date reviewed: 2016-06-12 23:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to authors The manuscript compared cadherin 1 in both diffuse type gastric cancer cells and mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) by using the Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia. The manuscript is relevant since genomic data may be useful in predicting anti-cancer drug sensitivity. The authors compared stem with cancer cells, analyzed under the light of several methods, including Gene expression and with the help of several sources of data bases. In particular, the authors focused on the expression of catenin beta interacting protein 1, which is critical for both cancer and stem cells. To compare catenin beta interacting protein 1 the authors used the cBioPortal for Cancer Genomics 3D complex structure databases. Interestingly, the authors found that catenin beta interacting protein 1 was significantly up-regulated in GC cells with respect to MSCs. Also, they found that many probe sets were up-regulated or down regulated in GC cells when compared to MSCs. In general, the manuscript is interesting not only for scientific reasons, but also due to its potential clinical relevance, since it provides some light about the relationships between stem and cancer cells. The main difficulties with the manuscript are the following: 4) It is not clear through the text what the main purpose of the work is. 5) The conclusions of the work are not clearly stated , and 6) The work is too

long. Therefore, the authors should highlight the aim of their work both, in the abstract and in the introduction sections. Also, at the beginning of the Discussion section, the authors should state clearly, which are their main conclusions of their work. Finally the authors should considerably reduce their manuscript.