ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8915
Title: Weight Gain Following Breast Cancer Diagnosis: Implication and Proposed Mechanisms
Reviewer code: 00532382
Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen
Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 17:08
Date reviewed: 2014-01-14 14:37

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting review. Congratulations. I enjoyed reading it. Should be published. No revision required.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8915
Title: Weight Gain Following Breast Cancer Diagnosis: Implication and Proposed Mechanisms
Reviewer code: 00505537
Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen
Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 17:08
Date reviewed: 2014-01-16 17:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] 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

1)Authors should be think about the concept that it   is the treatment of breast cancer the cause that provoke weight gain so it would better to change the title of the study   Weight Gain Following Breast Cancer Treatment: Implication and Proposed Mechanisms 2. The structure of the article is unconventional and a bit anarchic it might be improved, for example, explaining the method use to gather the articles which are mentioned in Table 1 or maybe converting it in a review. 3. Levine et al. followed 32 women over a two-year period and reported in 1991 that 63% gained weight with an average gain at two years was of 6 kg.[Change in the size of words. I suposse that is a mistake. 4. Authors should consider include some comments about the fact that women who are younger and closer to ideal BMI are good candidates to prostesis breast reconstruction after mastectomy and this must be taken into consideration because weight gain could detiorate the cosmetic outcome.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8915
Title: Weight Gain Following Breast Cancer Diagnosis: Implication and Proposed Mechanisms
Reviewer code: 02860540
Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen
Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 17:08
Date reviewed: 2014-02-25 04:34

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

 I reviewed with interest the paper entitled "Weight Gain Following Breast Cancer Diagnosis: Implication and Proposed Mechanisms". The manuscpript is well writed and very interesting. All the most relevant issues are exhaustively discussed I have only a curiosity, Have ever been studied in these subjects the genetic polymorphisms o genes implicated in the weight gain (e.g. FTO)?

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8915
Title: Weight Gain Following Breast Cancer Diagnosis: Implication and Proposed Mechanisms
Reviewer code: 02567328
Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen
Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 17:08
Date reviewed: 2014-02-25 07:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] 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
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic of the review is important but there are not novelty or innovation of the research because the work is a continuous list of studies. The manuscript represents a narrative review in which the authors report and summarize the results obtained in different studies published in an extensive period of time until 2013. I believe that the authors could have given a greater personal contribution to the work in terms of criticism about the studies reported.   However the manuscript is well written and organized and can represent a suitable and exhaustive review for a first approach of this specific topic.