ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology
ESPS manuscript NO: 14825
Title: Comparative Effectiveness of Abiraterone before and after Chemotherapy in Patients with Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer -A Meta-Analysis
Reviewer's code: 00181388
Reviewer's country: Iran
Science editor: Yue-Li Tian
Date sent for review: 2014-10-28 08:12
Date reviewed: 2014-10-31 22:05

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
[ ] Grade C: Good		[ ] Duplicate publication	
[Y] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors of the manuscript entitled "Comparative Effectiveness of Abiraterone before and after Chemotherapy in Patients with Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer -A Meta-Analysis". My comments are as below: 1. Two studies are less than standarad for doing meta-analysis. Some other methods like survey data analysis are preferred in such cases. Moreover, they have simply excluded some studies with additional treatment. They could use subgroup analysis or sensitivity analysis based on different additional treatments or other accessory variables. As a suggestion, they could avoid too much narrowing selection criteria for including similar studies. For example, trials with lower phase could be included in final analysis. Totally, the present analysis is not suitable for only two studies. 2. Phrases like "metastatic castrate resistant prostate cancer" or "metastatic castration resistant prostate cancer" are not enough sensitive search phrase. 3. Keywords are not MeSH words. 4. Invalid is not a suitable term for heterogeneity test.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The title should be changed to reflect that the chemo is docetaxel and that, although this is, in theory, a meta-analysis, it deals with only 2 phase 3 randomized trials. This should mentioned at the bottom of page 6 where "Because the 2 clinical trials...." is mentioned. 2. On page 6, data is pleural and it should be "data were..." 3. On page 13 "however, did not ascertain" is not a complete sentence. Later, there should not be comma after "Even though, ..." 4. The top of page 15 should start as new paragraph because it is a new and important subject. On the 5th line of that paragraph/page after CRPC, there should be ":" and not ";" 5. On page 17, 3rd line up from the bottom, would not use "accurate"-like words twice.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology
ESPS manuscript NO: 14825
Title: Comparative Effectiveness of Abiraterone before and after Chemotherapy in Patients with Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer -A Meta-Analysis
Reviewer's code: 00742507
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Yue-Li Tian
Date sent for review: 2014-10-28 08:12
Date reviewed: 2014-12-22 23:23

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

Solid up-to-date review, important topics. The aim of the review is clinically significant, the conclusions too.