



**ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Urology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10900

**Title:** Spontaneous Regression of Renal Cell Carcinoma - reality or myth?

**Reviewer code:** 02615120

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-29 09:23

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-29 23:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ Y] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[ ] Existing	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1) This review presents a careful and appropriate bibliography regarding the controversial issue of spontaneous regression of renal cell carcinoma. Despite a few typographical errors it can be viewed as a well written manuscript. 2) I partially disagree with the definition presented on page 2, 3rd line from bottom. In some cases, "spontaneous" regression follows an intervention such as cytoreductive nephrectomy, as reported by Markewitz and coworkers some decades ago (and, more recently, by Van Poppel and Baert). Therefore I recommend a slight modification of the definition, which could include the idea of regression induced by local treatments such as radiotherapy or embolisation of the primary tumor. The report by Horn & Horn (1971) is another example in which a probable "immune factor" can be postulated to exist in the plasma of a patient that experienced regression of RCC. The more stringent definition given on page 5, line 7 from bottom could be presented at the beginning of the text. 3) The immune defense mechanisms against metastatic RCC should be better explained. The paper by Dantal et al (1998) would help to present more adequately the possible role of immunosuppression in the increased risk of cancer development. And the opposite: the action of the immune system in tumor regression, including RCC. 4) I strongly recommend presentation of at least one histological verification of regression (though they are controversial and not unequivocally confirmed). This would add some degree of criticism on the basis of an observation. And also to be a stimulus for the discussion of the "myth" among the readers of the journal. The same could be say for the controversial figures by Hamid and Poller (1998). 5) The Pansera's hypothesis must be



## 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>

---

presented with a more sophisticated detail in the hallmark of the stem cells world. I would like to recommend a chapter of a book (Goldenberg & Campos de Carvalho eds., 2013), in which the authors of this review could find some details of the embryogenic regression process that could also help them to present in more detail an interesting view for the "reality" (and for the "myth") of RCC regression.



# 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 Urology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10900

**Title:** Spontaneous Regression of Renal Cell Carcinoma - reality or myth?

**Reviewer code:** 00469307

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-29 09:23

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-06 12:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reviewed the hypothesis and the previous reports of spontaneous regression of RCC. The theme of the manuscript is interesting. Therefore, this manuscript is worth to accept for publication of the journal.