

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21148

**Title:** Update on human papillomavirus vaccination: Where are we now?

**Reviewer's code:** 01524125

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-03 13:22

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-25 15:31

| 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

The authors updated current situation of HPV vaccination simply, although there are no enough new knowledge provided by this review, this review summarized the current situation of HPV vaccine systematically. I have the following comments. 1. Title is not consistent with content, e.g. "Vaccine Development and Rationale" section had not told the readers the content of vaccine development and rationale. 2. Can you tell the readers why scientists developed bivalent, quadrivalent and 9vHPV vaccine? 3. It is better if the authors could summarized the worldwide HPV genotype distribution, and then discussed the possible contradiction between current HPV vaccines and the real distribution of HPV genotype. 4. Efficacy section: "Many subtypes exist of both oncogenic (high risk) and genital wart causing (low risk) HPV", please ensure the validity of terminology, genotype? Subgenotype? Type? Subtype? 5. Citations are not sufficient, for example, no citation for "Worldwide, cervical cancer is the fourth most frequent cancer in women affecting almost 500,000 women each year and is the most common cause of cancer death among women in developing countries.", beginning of the introduction. No citation for "The median time from HPV infection to seroconversion is approximately 8-12 months, however because HPV infection is restricted to the intraepithelial layer



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

of the mucosa it does not induce a strong immune response.” Discussion section. No citation for  
“ Many subtypes exist of both oncogenic (high risk) and genital wart causing (low risk) HPV. Partial  
cross-protection against non-vaccine oncogenic HPV types has been reported, however the clinical  
relevance is undetermined.”

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21148

**Title:** Update on human papillomavirus vaccination: Where are we now?

**Reviewer's code:** 03091953

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-03 13:22

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-04 03:06

| 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 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"/> 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 checked="" 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

The article is well written, interesting and it provides a complete revision about HPV vaccination worldwide. Please address minor points that I listed in the "word" document attached, in track changes/commments modality.