



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29586

Title: Salient concerns in using analgesia for cancer pain among outpatients: A cluster analysis study

Reviewer's code: 00190038

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-08-23 15:25

Date reviewed: 2016-09-07 17:05

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"/> 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 checked="" 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 present study attempts to investigate if patients' preference to use analgesics for cancer pain is related to numerous variables. Data analysis -Page 9: Regarding the LCV score and the threshold for a distinct % change how the number of patients enrolled in the study may have affected this threshold? Results and Tables -Page 10: A flow diagram showing patient recruitment with exclusions missing values and the reasons for missing values in the appropriate boxes is required. -These tables are exhaustive. I do not believe that readers will spend time going through 13 or so tables. For example the authors may skip the first four tables, name in the text the variables and mention that the 207 patients did not differ regarding for example cancer stage, or employment status etc for all the variables that there is no significant difference and incorporate in one table only the variables in which a statistically significant difference is found. Also under each variable the number of patients analyzed must be written, Delete the a and b superscripts next to variable and at the bottom of each table, is confusing. -Table 5 is redundant. The authors may describe briefly in the text by expanding the 1st paragraph under the paragraph Cluster 1 (pain relief). -In tables 6, 7, 8, 9,



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>

10, 11, 12 and 13 add the number of patients under each variable type and under the variable analyzed. Discussion -Start the Discussion with a sentence summarizing the main results of your study. -“The 2016 CDC guidelines provides...” change to “The 2016 CDC guidelines provide...”
-Page 14: No need to repeat the results in the Discussion section. -Page 16: Close the Discussion with a conclusion relating the existing clusters to the patients’ preferences to consume analgesics for cancer pain.



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29586

Title: Salient concerns in using analgesia for cancer pain among outpatients: A cluster analysis study

Reviewer's code: 02487948

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-08-23 15:25

Date reviewed: 2016-10-06 20:47

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

First, there are far too many tables, one cannot see the wood for the trees - the authors should try to condense their data and perhaps provide their tables as supplementary material. Second, the manuscript needs some language polishing. Third, some references are not clear to me, e.g.: On p4 the authors write: "This is important as recent studies suggest that patients' preferences are highly consequential and influence actual pain treatment decisions" - and then they cite a paper that deals with parents and their cancer suffering children; IMHO something different than mentioned in the sentence. Fourth, the authors should describe in 1-2 sentences the procedures they used - a mere reference 13 seems not enough to me (see p5). Minor points: SAS version? Ref 48 should be replaced with a more general study about fear of disease progression in cancer