

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21154

Title: Neuroendocrine tumors resistant to mTOR inhibitors: A difficult conversion from biology to the clinic

Reviewer's code: 03413409

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-03 15:54

Date reviewed: 2015-07-05 20:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input 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 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

In the present manuscript Author briefly discussed about the challenges associated with transition of pre-clinical findings into the clinical setting. Specifically, he reported the story of BEZ235 development, a multitargeted inhibitor which showed impressive pre-clinical activity but failed to show anti-tumor activity in the clinical setting. It also proved to be more toxic than other mTOR inhibitor like everolimus in this same setting. I don't have comments or concerns that may preclude further consideration for publication of this article.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21154

Title: Neuroendocrine tumors resistant to mTOR inhibitors: A difficult conversion from biology to the clinic

Reviewer's code: 02793333

Reviewer's country: Switzerland

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-03 15:54

Date reviewed: 2015-07-07 19:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The editorial entitled "Neuroendocrine tumors resistant to mTOR inhibitors: a difficult conversion of biological aspects to clinical application" provides an important as well as up-to date statement relevant for NET and general Oncology.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21154

Title: Neuroendocrine tumors resistant to mTOR inhibitors: A difficult conversion from biology to the clinic

Reviewer's code: 02520388

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-03 15:54

Date reviewed: 2015-07-22 17:53

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input 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 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 of Nicola Fazio deals with the clinically and scientifically very relevant topic of the huge differences between successful preclinical testing of novel anti-cancer compounds and their actual clinical effectiveness. Taking mTOR inhibition of neuroendocrine gastrointestinal tumors an example the author clearly describes the problem and failure of bringing an innovative compound such as BEZ235 from bench to bedside. The message of the paper is clear however, I missed some interpretation on the possible reasons and underlying mechanisms that account for the clinical failure of the multi-target inhibitor BEZ235 in neuroendocrine gastrointestinal tumors. The concluding remark that "It is clear that transportomics and metabolomics are poorly known areas which can influence strictly the destiny of a drug." (page 2 last paragraph) is too general and needs interpretation and some more detailed explanation by taking actual work in the field into account. Generally, the text is well-written, but there are various grammatical and spelling mistakes, so the English needs a little brush-up.