

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 38211

Title: Epitranscriptomics of cancer

Reviewer's code: 00908662

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-02-07

Date reviewed: 2018-02-16

Review time: 8 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review, Marina Tusup , Thomas Kundig and Steve Pascolo have systematically analyzed the most relevant post-transcriptional RNA modifications reported in the literature and have elucidated their potential role in regulating cancer initiation and progression. This is a good manuscript, dealing with very interesting topics in a

rapidly emerging area. My only concern is related to the lack of a summarizing section that helps the reader to understand the general meaning of the data presented. I suggest to improve the manuscript with the addition of some sentences (in particular in section 1) including a more critical analysis of the biological and clinical relevance of the findings reported. Minor points: pag 8. The second sentence at the beginning of section 2.1 ("It is suggested that tumorigenesis") is not clear: it should be rewritten in order to become more easily comprehensible by the reader. pag 8. In the second paragraph of section 2.1 ("Translation of these proteins relies") the mechanism of IRES mRNA translation initiation should be explained in more details: note that every cellular mRNAs have a 5' cap but IRES dependent translation is active only in specific conditions. pag 10. The two first paragraphs should include more references. See for instance the references reported in a recent review by Penzo et al. (Pseudouridylation in physiology and medicine: for better and for worse. Genes 2017; 8(11), 301). Figures are too simple and schematic: they should be enriched by a more detailed description and improved in the graphics quality. In conclusion, I recommend the paper for publication in the World Journal of Clinical Oncology, but it should be revised taking into account these comments and remarks before being accepted.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

[] The same title

[] Duplicate publication

[] Plagiarism

[Y] No