ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8358
Title: Current status of predictive biomarkers for neoadjuvant therapy in esophageal cancer
Reviewer code: 01799430
Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin
Date sent for review: 2013-12-27 10:23
Date reviewed: 2013-12-29 11:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article on biomarkers for neoadjuvant therapy for advanced esopahgeal cancers. Although there is still not any good biomakers, the authors summarized the biomarkers that have been suggested till now. This article is thought to give readers very valuable information.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8358
Title: Current status of predictive biomarkers for neoadjuvant therapy in esophageal cancer
Reviewer code: 00504373
Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin
Date sent for review: 2013-12-27 10:23
Date reviewed: 2014-01-02 21:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Very well written, thorough and informative.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8358
Title: Current status of predictive biomarkers for neoadjuvant therapy in esophageal cancer
Reviewer code: 02441274
Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin
Date sent for review: 2013-12-27 10:23
Date reviewed: 2014-01-06 17:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[Y] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[Y] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is a good summary of available material on predictive biomarkers for neoadjuvant therapy is esophageal cancers. Major concerns however, are: 1. English is very poor with grammatical mistakes throughout the article. A professional help is required to improve English.   2. Most of the article mentions the biomarkers and quotes one study with mentioning the result to be significant. I feel it is very important to quote sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive value as well as accuracy of these biomarkers. A table (may be for each of the seven category) with these parameters (wherever available) will certainly improve the quality of paper.   3. Squamous cell carcinoma and adenocarcinoma of esophagus are actually two diseases with different behavior and response to CRT. Any article clubbing two diseases together is not appropriate. Though authors have mentioned this (albeit mildly), this needs to be emphasized and analysis of data needs to be done accordingly.   4. Unfortunately majority of data is based on single study on a relatively small group of patients. The data where same markers have been compared is limited to only 2 sets of markers (out of 23). Here again these studies have given contradictory results i.e. Reference 67 and 68 contradicts the result of results of Ref 66 on EGFR and Reference no 67, 72 and 71 contradics the result of Reference 70 regarding p 53 – these data make the biomarkers role doubtful and this needs to be emphasized.   5. Study 21 deals with breast cancer and this should be clearly mentioned on page 8.   6. First line of abstract should be deleted.   7. Author needs to compare techniques of performing various biomarkers in terms of availability, cost, ease and reproducibility of methodology. 8. Some of recent references should be included e.g. a. Philips RE et al, Dis Esophagus 2013; 26 : 299 b. Minato T et al, Ann Sung Oncol 2013 ; 20 : 209 c. Okamoto H et al, World J Sung Oncol 2013; March 1

d. Zhang SS et al, Ann Sung Oncol 2013; 20: 2919 e. Slotta et al al Br J Cancer 2013; 109: 370   9. Mention of uselessness of miRNAs (page 13) in differentiating pancreatic adenocarcinoma from chronic pancreatitis is irrelevant, since this review addresses the issue of biomarkers differentiating responsive malignancies from resistant malignancies.   10. Reference (most of them) have used inappropriate abbreviation for journal's name such as American Journal of Surgery, Annals of surgical Oncology; The New England Journal of Medicine. Page numbers should be complete e.g. Ref No 3; Page number should be 538-543 and not 538-43. This is as per World Journal format.