

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15371

Title: Screening for lung cancer with chest computerized tomography - is it cost efficient?

Reviewer's code: 00608185

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 19:24

Date reviewed: 2014-12-05 07:04

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

This manuscript regarding the cost-effectiveness analyses of LDCT for lung cancer was interesting. However, more description in detail is necessary. Especially, in Conclusions, the author showed that the first condition is careful formulation and observance of inclusion and exclusion criteria...., however, the author did not show what criteria were effective. This analysis in accordance with the economic status of the countries is needed.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respiriology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15371

Title: Screening for lung cancer with chest computerized tomography - is it cost efficient?

Reviewer's code: 00186496

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 19:24

Date reviewed: 2014-12-27 23:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input 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 benefit of lung cancer screening with Low dose chest computerized tomography is inconclusive. the authors studied several prospective observational studies and evaluate cost-effectiveness. I have the following comments. (1) The authors should tell the readers how they pull out the prospective observational studies. How did they set the mesh term in pubmed, and how many original studies were analyzed to get the final literatures included in the study. (2) The information in Table 1 is not informative. The author should mention the advocate or denounce opinion on the screening of each team in table 1. How about the smoking status of the cases? The authors should add the cost of CT and treatment, and pathological types into table I. In other word, the readers can get the whole information from the table and figures without the boring text in the manuscript (3) what is subtype A and B adenocarcinoma? (4) The conclusion should be re-organized to make it more informative, e.g., the authors mentioned "the first condition is careful formulation and observance of inclusion and exclusion criteria to screening program which will ensure that screening will be performed only in high risk population, excluding patients who are not suitable for radical surgical treatment....."



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>

However, how to define the high risk population?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15371

Title: Screening for lung cancer with chest computerized tomography - is it cost efficient?

Reviewer's code: 00608130

Reviewer's country: Czech Repoublic

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 19:24

Date reviewed: 2014-12-19 06:58

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

Dear dr.Szczesny, I have reviewed your manuscript and from the aspect of the topic it is fully up-to-date. Nevertheless I miss there your own opinion and results more in detail, despite I know that a manuscript on this topic is under consideration in another journal. In the Conclusion I miss the outcome (take home message)- the recommendation for screening- to whom and when, i.e. what would be the optimal screening programme from your own point of view.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15371

Title: Screening for lung cancer with chest computerized tomography - is it cost efficient?

Reviewer's code: 00607657

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 19:24

Date reviewed: 2014-12-28 21:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

The present article is aiming to perform the study of organized and cost-effectiveness analyses to investigate the clinical worth of low dose computered tomography inlung cancer screening. However, the analysis is not very powerful. And there are also many grammar errors in the text.