

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

ESPS manuscript NO: 21172

Title: Oncofertility in adolescent and young adult hereditary cancer: Considerations for genetics professionals

Reviewer's code: 00742250

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-04 18:35

Date reviewed: 2015-07-05 09:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 review article has a high scientific value to be published in the WJMG.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

ESPS manuscript NO: 21172

Title: Oncofertility in adolescent and young adult hereditary cancer: Considerations for genetics professionals

Reviewer's code: 02446005

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-04 18:35

Date reviewed: 2015-07-14 19:00

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"/> 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 is a well written MS. It is very interesting, up-to-date and and may be important for all the personell working in this contest. I have only few minor comments: in the paragraph Fertility and cancer, when the AUthors discuss about fertility preservation by cryopreservation,they should mention about the fact that gametes (and tissues in general) may undergo cryodamage which may affect even the genetic material. This is particularly true for male gametes (there is a lot of literature concerning this fact). Also, the fact that in about 90% of male cancer patients, spermatogenesis may start again after chemotherapy shuld be mentioned (and indeed the rate of use of cryopreserved sperm is very low, about 10%). This fact points out the need of counseling about the genetic damage after cheom- or radio-therapy, as spermatogenesis may be good after 1- 2 years, but there is eveidence of genetic damage in sperm till about 2 years after (clearly it depends on the type of chemo- or radiotherapy). In the paragraph Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD), please note that PGD is not a atype of ART, but, rather, it is an option that may be offer as part of ART procedure. PGD procedure is not without risk for embryo and maybe this fact should be mentioned.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

ESPS manuscript NO: 21172

Title: Oncofertility in adolescent and young adult hereditary cancer: Considerations for genetics professionals

Reviewer's code: 00729478

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-04 18:35

Date reviewed: 2015-07-06 15:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

well written ,very interesting

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

ESPS manuscript NO: 21172

Title: Oncofertility in adolescent and young adult hereditary cancer: Considerations for genetics professionals

Reviewer's code: 00742130

Reviewer's country: Israel

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-04 18:35

Date reviewed: 2015-07-18 22:36

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 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 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 checked="" 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

1. The authors may want to add and elaborate on the recent discovery that the origin of ovarian carcinoma may be from tubal origin. Is there a possible extrapolation to discuss prophylactic bilateral salpingectomy for BRCA carriers several years before oophorectomy? 2. Among the options for fertility preservation options, the authors completely disregard the option of GnRHa administration to minimize gonadotoxicity and prevent menometrorrhagia during chemotherapy induced thrombocytopenia. 3. Regarding CVS in the sentence " This process typically includes fetal cell sampling during the eleventh through fourteenth weeks of pregnancy or amniocentesis in later weeks" - the term "...fetal cell sampling..." should be changed to "chorionic" or "placental" "cell sampling".