

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15387

Title: Current methods of staging and restaging of the mediastinal nodes in non-small-cel lung cancer

Reviewer's code: 02497950

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 19:40

Date reviewed: 2014-12-03 18:00

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

The author analyzed the current methods of primary staging and repeated staging (restaging) of the mediastinal nodes in non-small-cel lung cancer. This is a well-written review.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15387

Title: Current methods of staging and restaging of the mediastinal nodes in non-small-cell lung cancer

Reviewer's code: 00186496

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 19:40

Date reviewed: 2015-01-16 23:50

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 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"/> 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

This is a system review regarding the current methods of primary staging and repeated staging (restaging) of the mediastinal nodes in non-small-cell lung cancer. This review is informative. I have the following comments: (1) a diagram should be used to list all the sensitivity and specificity of these methods; (2) a diagram should be used to describe the strategy to use these methods in various patients.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15387

Title: Current methods of staging and restaging of the mediastinal nodes in non-small-cell lung cancer

Reviewer's code: 00608206

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 19:40

Date reviewed: 2015-01-17 20:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input 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"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS: GENERAL COMMENTS Review article on the Current methods of staging and restaging of the mediastinal nodes in non-small-cell lung cancer. Topic of interest serviced properly. References are acceptably date: > 60% (44/724) of the last 5 years. The structure of the article and its general outline is correct (Title, Running title, Keywords, Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions and References). There are no ethical problems.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS: **TITLE:** Correct. Specific, it adequately contains the primary endpoint. (Words: 14). **ABSTRACT:** Define and explain the concepts well properly structure review article. Key words: Correct **INTRODUCTION:** Clear and correct introduction. Well structured. Updated and nicely summarizes the current reality of the diagnosis and treatment of lung cancer in different TNM stages. Comments on new technologies (proteomics or metabolomics) for possible future application. Clearly indicates the purpose of the article. The **DIFFERENT SECTIONS** (Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions and References) are clear and well structured, however: 1.- **Methods:** The selection criteria, in addition to included in PubMed (2009-2014) are unclear. Not a

Systematic Review: Have you considered using the methodology PRISMA? Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Int J Surg*. 2010;8(5):336-41. Epub 2010 Feb 18. Erratum in: *Int J Surg*. 2010;8(8):658. [Medline: 20171303] [doi: 10.1016/j.ijssu.2010.02.007] Should indicate the keywords used in the search strategy in PubMed 2.- Results: Appropriate wording and highlights the interesting aspects of the review. Adequately describe the indications, advantages and disadvantages of different diagnostic techniques. Many comments regarding the results could be included in the discussion. 3.- Discussion and Conclusions: Correct. 4.- References: Review (41?). Review all literature. Zielinski M: Author with various and relevant publications on the topic reviewed. The references are up to date (>60% of the last 5 years) in adequate numbers (72 references). 5.- Tables: Value could be the inclusion of a summary of the results table. Diagnostic technique analyzed Author Reference (year) Design Sample size ... The review is presented in a clear and correct form. MINOR COMMENTS See minimal comments on the attachment.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respirology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15387

Title: Current methods of staging and restaging of the mediastinal nodes in non-small-cell lung cancer

Reviewer's code: 00608210

Reviewer's country: Thailand

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 19:40

Date reviewed: 2015-01-19 11:13

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" 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

Dear Editor, I thank you very much for giving the opportunity to review this manuscript. Below are my comments. 1. This is not a study. It should be a review. There is no any analysis. The authors just cited the article that had already statistically summarized the previous studies. Therefore, the authors should not use the format of original article in this manuscript. 2. Introduction. This manuscript is about methods of staging. However, it begins with treatment and prognosis that do not match to the topic. It is needed to be changed. 3. The authors summarized the diagnostic efficacy of various methods by using only one paper. (Ref 15 Methods for staging non-small cell lung cancer: Diagnosis and management of lung cancer, 3rd ed: American College of Chest Physicians evidence-based clinical practice guidelines. Chest. 2013;143(5 Suppl):e211S-50S.) In my opinion, if I have to spend my time to read the review about Methods for staging non-small cell lung cancer, I prefer to read Ref 15 rather than this manuscript. This review is not better than the previous. In addition, it is not as good as the previous. 4. The authors should consider professional and/or native English speaker advice for writing the academic manuscript. In addition, the authors should check the manuscript before



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>

submission. For example, Page 7 [21-6]; Page 11 [Szlubowski56], [57-59 von Bartheld].