

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

ESPS manuscript NO: 26827

Title: Targeting stem cells by radiation: From the biological angle to clinical aspects

Reviewer's code: 00503286

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-28 22:45

Date reviewed: 2016-04-30 13:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper "Targeting stem cells by radiation: from the biological angle to clinical aspects" should be published in World Journal of Stem Cells, after minor corrections with the editor. (I think: some figures or/and tables were welcome!)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

ESPS manuscript NO: 26827

Title: Targeting stem cells by radiation: From the biological angle to clinical aspects

Reviewer's code: 00504828

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-28 22:45

Date reviewed: 2016-05-16 05:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review discusses the clinical efficacy and toxicity of radiotherapy centering glioma as the main topic. The first section discusses two clinical studies of glioma treated with radiotherapy. The authors points out the need of in vivo imaging to precisely target cancer stem cell niches. In the following section, the side effect in whole-brain radiotherapy and head/neck cancer. The review is well-focused and the structure of the story is good. Appropriate papers are cited. Major comments 1. Page 11, lines 5~8 "Thanks to the development of the intensity modulated radiotherapy...". I think it would be difficult for non-expert to follow exactly what IMRT is. I recommend inserting a short paragraph to introduce IMRT. 2. Introduction is excellent - however, I am disappointed a little bit that the authors do not discuss Wnt/ β -catenin and Notch signaling later. I am just curious if there is any published research or clinical trials that examine the combination of Wnt/ β -catenin or Notch signaling inhibitors and radiotherapy. 3. I am fine with this well-focused review discussing glioma and head and neck cancer. However - if the authors stick on these narrow topics - the current title does not reflect the contents well. I think the authors may consider revising the title. Otherwise, the review should be more comprehensive covering other cancers treated with radiotherapy. Minor



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>

comments 1. There are several minor grammatical errors. I attach the file (PDF) with correction instead of typing each here (also yellow-highlighted). I may miss additional minor errors. The authors may want to carefully check the text again.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

ESPS manuscript NO: 26827

Title: Targeting stem cells by radiation: From the biological angle to clinical aspects

Reviewer's code: 02446101

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-28 22:45

Date reviewed: 2016-05-22 15:10

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Firstly, I don't think the abstract summarizes the whole manuscript well. An abstract should be a summary of a longer text, especially of an academic article. It is more like a introduction. Secondly, there are several language mistakes. For example, the 'healthy' in the last line of page 3 was spelt wrongly as 'healty'. The language need to be rechecked.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

ESPS manuscript NO: 26827

Title: Targeting stem cells by radiation: From the biological angle to clinical aspects

Reviewer's code: 02928802

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-28 22:45

Date reviewed: 2016-05-25 12:29

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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 manuscript by Serkan Alexis Vallard et al. reviewed "Targeting stem cells by radiation: from the biological angle to clinical aspects". The paper is novel, there are some suggestions. 1. The abstract should be a summarization of the paper. However, the abstract in this article seems like an introduction of this paper. The abstract is poor designed. It is suggested to rewrite the abstract for clear understanding. 2. The main structure of this paper only contains two sections: "Targeting CSC with radiation: Efficacy data" and "Sparing normal stem cells during radiotherapy: Toxicity data". These two sections only discussed the advantages and disadvantages of targeting CSC with radiation. And it is difficult for the authors to get the points of this paper quickly. Therefore, more detailed contents and clear sections should be provided for brief understanding. 3. There are numerous grammar errors in this article. The language must be rechecked! For example: Page 3, of "healty" tissue stem cells radiation-induced destruction in long term side effects of Page 5, CSC "are" defined by three main characteristics: they can initiate tumorigenesis and endlessly Page 7, NSC "were" showed to be physiologically housed in the subventricular zone (SVZ), ...