

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29233

Title: Circulating cytokeratin-positive cells and tumor budding in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 03270786

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-08-05 11:22

Date reviewed: 2016-08-09 00:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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

Dear Authors, I would like to congratulate you well designed and executed research. I my personal opinion putting attention to tumour budding and bloodstream delivering is important for creation new attempt to a categorisation CRC. Although, molecular profiling of CRC becomes a standard, the changes in grading cancer should be made soon. Enrichment of landscape of predictive/prognostic factors is a need in Age of personalised therapy. I have found a few misprints - Abstract. There is used CK2 (correctly should be CK18 (Clone CK2), Page 8 - Table XXX, Graphs description double 'negative' and in B 'negativ' 'positiv' All this is not important and resulted from inattention.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29233

Title: Circulating cytokeratin-positive cells and tumor budding in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 03551824

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-08-05 11:22

Date reviewed: 2016-08-09 10:00

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 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 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 checked="" 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 study investigated the clinical significance of CTCs in mesenteric vein of surgical specimen using immunohistochemistry. The author concluded that CTCs have no prognostic significance. Although this conclusion seems resonable, this study included only 56 patients, which may be insufficient for leading the conclusion. In this study, tumor budding and nodal metastasis were not significant prognostic factor in univariate analysis. These parameters are well-established, and significant factor in many studies. I am affraid that these indicate insufficient number of patients in this study.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29233

Title: Circulating cytokeratin-positive cells and tumor budding in colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 03003594

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-08-05 11:22

Date reviewed: 2016-08-14 21:06

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 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 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 checked="" 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

SUMMARY This is an interesting manuscript which appears to add to the existing body of literature around this subject. The design is clear, however the sample size may be too small, with no description of a sample size/power calculation. Study strengths and limitations, including the small size of the study, were appropriately acknowledged by the authors in the discussion, who noted that it is underpowered to detect effects smaller than expected. **MATERIALS AND METHODS** There is a discrepancy regarding patient consent - in the materials and methods section it says that "informed and written consent was obtained from all patients" yet in the data sharing statement it says that patient consent was not obtained. The authors state that CK+ cells/clusters were counted manually in the blood samples. Was this count performed by a single person or by multiple people? Was there any chance for inter-observer variation here? The authors state that the surgical technique did not influence the occurrence of CK+ cells/clusters - was there any potential for inter-observer variation with this technique, e.g. multiple surgeons; surgery performed at more than one site etc. **STATISTICS** The statistical methods used seem appropriate and clear. **GRAMMAR/SPELLING** Page 5, line 2 - "Additional data were acquired clinical and laboratory



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>

information systems." Should this include the word 'from'? Page 8, line 3 - it says "(Table XXX)" which I think should say "(Table 1)" Page 20, Table 2 - in the bottom line it should say "no separate evaluation for blood samples" DISCUSSION If there had been evidence that CK+ cells in the mesenteric blood of colorectal cancer specimens were a demonstrable prognostic factor, would this lead to an avoidance of "delay and additional risk during the operation"? Perhaps this statement could be further clarified.