

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21247

Title: Estrogen receptor alpha amplification in breast cancer: 25 years of debate

Reviewer's code: 00742507

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-07-07 13:26

Date reviewed: 2015-08-25 02:23

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

An excellent review of an important topics. The literature is adequate. The only problem is in the lack of any conclusions. Future directions are important, but the review should end in some kind of conclusion, so the reader will understand which output to take with him after reading the paper.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21247

Title: Estrogen receptor alpha amplification in breast cancer: 25 years of debate

Reviewer's code: 02104609

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-07-07 13:26

Date reviewed: 2015-08-26 05:10

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 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 checked="" 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		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article needs to be revised for English. Considerable sentences are too long to be followed. The readers may get lost. Here is an example: "A comparison of two different reference genes (ESR2 versus SOD2) with similar deletion frequency (~30%) according to TCGA, display similar copy number ratio pattern of tumors, with and without ESR1 amplification determined by FISH, over cases, but a huge difference in dynamic range of approximately a dimension within samples, suggesting rather technical issues of PCR approaches to be responsible for differences in study outcome than deletion frequency of the qPCR reference gene [35] (supplementary tables S1+S2 and supplementary graphs S1-- - S4)."

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21247

Title: Estrogen receptor alpha amplification in breast cancer: 25 years of debate

Reviewer's code: 00227350

Reviewer's country: Trinidad and Tobago

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-07-07 13:26

Date reviewed: 2015-09-01 07:53

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written Review

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21247

Title: Estrogen receptor alpha amplification in breast cancer: 25 years of debate

Reviewer's code: 00289387

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-07-07 13:26

Date reviewed: 2015-09-08 19:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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 authors submitted a review article discussing the 25-year debate of estrogen receptor alpha gene amplification (ESR1) in breast cancer. This is an interesting topic that is directly associated with breast cancer diagnosis and hormonal therapy. Overall, the paper is well-organized and written with several beautiful images illustrated in figures. A few minor issues need to be addressed. 1) Table 1. ERa negative (%) presented in both correlation and no correlation studies needs to be clarified, what does it mean for ER- as low % exists in these two-type studies? 2) Is it possible to add any evidence showing the correlation between ESR1 amplification and worse clinical outcomes without any hormonal treatment in Fig 5? 3) The authors should discuss more about ESR1 as a marker for both hormone sensitivity and resistance. For example, the nature of the gene low copy number and the tumor tissue heterogeneity may be the key factors that are accounted for initial sensitiveness to anti-ERa agents. Then some or most of the tissue lack of ESR1 amplification develop tumors that are resistant to the drugs, displaying tumor resistance. 4) A few places of typos should be corrected.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21247

Title: Estrogen receptor alpha amplification in breast cancer: 25 years of debate

Reviewer's code: 01940125

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-07-07 13:26

Date reviewed: 2015-07-17 12:00

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"/> 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

This is a well-organized and well-written review that provides comprehensive information to address the clinical significance as well as potential pitfalls of ESR amplification in cancer research. Based on the thinking flow of the authors, the main purpose of this review is to discuss whether ESR a real cancer driver that could be utilized as a therapeutic target. From the point of functional genomics, a true cancer driver should be defined with biological relevance from genomic/post-genomic levels, translational/clinical correlation to functional validation. Therefore, it is highly recommended that the authors also include some important conclusions based on cellular functional assays. Then, the readers will be able to find the solution of the 25-year debate. Some minor points are as following 1. Labels in Table 1 are confusing: a. There is "ER- %" in this table, so how about "%"? dose not mean ER+, ESR amplification or others? b. Id "%" indicates ER+ frequency, why the sum of ER+ and ER- dose not equal 100. Some were undetectable? c. The data of Li 2013 should be removed since the data of both "%" and "ER-%" are not available. 2. "et al." in the text should be *Italic*.