Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Biological Chemistry
ESPS Manuscript NO: 9046
Title: In 2014, Can We Do Better Than CA125 in the Early Detection of Ovarian Cancer?
Reviewer code: 00693245
Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan
Date sent for review: 2014-01-18 20:02
Date reviewed: 2014-01-27 10:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] 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)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review summarized current biomarkers, images, and multimodality screening strategies in the detection of ovarian cancer at an early-stage. This information is very helpful to physicians and scientists who are performing basic and translational research. Several minor concerns need to be addressed: 1. Line 105-106: "1 in 70 women in the United States will develop ovarian cancer……" , is it correct? 2. Line 301: "abnormal adnexal pathology" should be "abnormal adnexal morphology". 3. Lines 312-316: Ultrasound screening does not increase five-year survival by itself. Instead, the benefit of ultrasound screening should be finding ovarian cancer in early stage. Authors should make it clear in the manuscript, not only citing the data. 4. After reviewing several studies regarding multimodality screening, authors should give their own opinions.

Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Biological Chemistry
ESPS Manuscript NO: 9046
Title: In 2014, Can We Do Better Than CA125 in the Early Detection of Ovarian Cancer?
Reviewer code: 00066723
Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan
Date sent for review: 2014-01-18 20:02
Date reviewed: 2014-02-07 22:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] 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	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is a comprehensive review dealing with the different imaging methodologies and multimodality screening strategies and biomarkers that are currently used and/or tested to detect early stage ovarian cancer. The senior author has published on this topic before. The current manuscript is well written and present a up-to-date and timely overview of the topic. Changes are coming due to the advent of the "omics approaches" which will undoubtedly yield novel putative biomarkers. Importantly the manuscript outlines the various steps that need to be taken to develop biomarkers from the preclinical exploratory phase to the clinic in order to come up with useful and reliable biomarkers. Major Comments 1. Line 331 – 334 – The percentages given here in the text do not match with the percentages listed in Table 2. Please check. Also reference 89 is not included in Table 2. 2. Line 339 – 342 – The text shows percentages on sensitivity and specificity for ROMA vs LR2. However in Table 2 the percentages are listed the other way around. Please check carefully and correct. Minor comments 1. Line 122 – caner should be cancer 2. Line 347 – Note that Table 2 refers to more references than 44-52. Please correct. 3. Line 434 – sited should be cited