

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18735

Title: Adjuvant chemotherapy for rectal cancer - is it needed?

Reviewer's code: 00185438

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-04-27 08:40

Date reviewed: 2015-05-06 03:40

| 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 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper raises an important question about the role of adjuvant chemotherapy in rectal cancer. The structure of the paper is not very clear, because many issues are mixed together. It seems that authors had no general idea how to present the problem. In the introduction section the questioned role of adjuvant chemotherapy after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy is underlined. However in the further text, neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy is mixed with neoadjuvant chemotherapy which is not the same. The reference no 6 is not properly interpreted on page 1. However properly interpreted on page 6. The reference no 7 is not properly presented (reference list), and the interpretation in the introduction shows that it was falsely cited – wrong conclusion from the reference. The QUASAR trial is overused and its importance is overestimated. It is impossible to draw all the conclusions from reference no 12. The role of CT and other imaging techniques is rather related to neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy, not neoadjuvant chemotherapy. As well as the problem of inappropriate LN staging. All of the cited references related to aforementioned problems with pathological assessment of the LN are about CRT. There is no clear evidence that neoadjuvant chemotherapy affects the pathological staging of proximal LN. Radiotherapy does not cover this



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

field. "Tumor growth fact - alpha" - transforming growth factor alpha should be used. The section "Novel Therapies" is not about something novel.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18735

Title: Adjuvant chemotherapy for rectal cancer - is it needed?

Reviewer's code: 03001454

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-04-27 08:40

Date reviewed: 2015-05-06 18:00

| 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"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this article Milinis K, et al, summarized these investigations and discussed their strengths and weaknesses. The authors gave some critical points that should be focused in the future evaluation on the efficacy of adjuvant chemootherapy for rectal cancer, e.g., choosing effective regimes, finding helpful biomarkers, and proper staging. The article is helpful to both researchers and clinicians. Minor points 1. A brief introduction about current therapy protocols, for example, neoadjuvant chemoratherpy/radiotherapy, surgery, adjuvant chemotherapy/radiotherapy, for rectal cancer is suggested at the very beginning of the article. 2. There is a typo in page 5 line 10: A "j" is missing in "neoaduvant".