

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Pharmacology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14392

**Title:** Improving cancer therapy by targeting cancer stem cells: directions, challenges, and clinical results.

**Reviewer's code:** 02446101

**Reviewer's country:** Afghanistan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-01 13:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-09 19:33

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

In general, it is a well-written manuscript reviewing advances of cancer therapy by targeting cancer stem cells. However, there are some comments on the manuscript. 1. The abstract should be rewritten. The definition of CSC should be clear and simplified in abstract. And unnecessary description should be deleted, like the first compelling description of CSC and CSC being identified in breast cancer in 2003. And the background and significance of this manuscript should be clear and highlighted. And the abstract could be integrated into one paragraph and the references should not be seen in abstract. 2. In the main text, there are too many short paragraphs. Some short paragraphs could be integrated into one paragraph. For example, in the part of the Clinical evidence for a role of CSC in cancer initiation, relapse and metastases, "These findings were confirmed recently by another report" and "In pancreatic cancer, expression of CSC markers CD133, CD44 and CD24 was found to correlate with poor prognosis" both are in separate paragraph, which make bad readability. 3. I advise some summaries and comparisons could be presented by the tables which could add its readability.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Pharmacology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14392

**Title:** Improving cancer therapy by targeting cancer stem cells: directions, challenges, and clinical results.

**Reviewer's code:** 00504441

**Reviewer's country:** Singapore

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-01 13:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-15 15:53

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

The review article by Ruffini et al on "Improving cancer therapy by targeting cancer stem cells: directions, challenges, and clinical results" is timely. The authors attempted to give an overview of the field of CSC, the challenges in definitely identifying them and the possible clinical implications.

1. References should not be in the abstract, and the abstract should be one paragraph. Please removed the sentence "In 2003 CSC were identified in breast cancer", this sentence is irrelevant here.
2. It would help if the authors summarized the various markers used to identify CSC in a table. Also, a table summarizing the various signaling pathways and therapeutics would help the readers to fully appreciate the challenges faced.
3. Too many short paragraphs in the main text. Please combine them and reword to make it more readable.
4. Contraction should be explained when it first appeared. For eg. G5. G3, LFT, SD, ORR, pCR, NACT etc.
5. Section "Notch signaling pathway" the authors mentioned the development of two antiDLL4 mAbs, and in the preceding sentence, the authors mentioned the Notch4 activity is upregulated in breast CSC. Is DLL4 an exclusive ligand of Notch4? Please reword the last three paragraphs of this section, because as it is, is very difficult to



## 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>

---

read. 6. Section "CXCR1/2..." reference is needed for CXCL8.... Key regulator of CSC activity"

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Pharmacology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14392

**Title:** Improving cancer therapy by targeting cancer stem cells: directions, challenges, and clinical results.

**Reviewer's code:** 00505183

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-01 13:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-14 02:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" 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 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 an interesting and useful manuscript that discusses various issues related to cancer stem cell (CSCs) targeting in vitro and in vivo with particular emphasis on relevant issues in designing clinical trials for CSCs-targeting drugs. The manuscript is well written, thorough, and appropriate references are cited. Moreover, scientists and clinicians from various cancer related disciplines will be interested in this manuscript.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Pharmacology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14392

**Title:** Improving cancer therapy by targeting cancer stem cells: directions, challenges, and clinical results.

**Reviewer's code:** 00699199

**Reviewer's country:** Afghanistan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-01 13:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-14 02:52

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 an informative review but a bit difficult to read. The following suggestions are suggestions to increase clarity. 1. Decrease the number of acronyms used in the text. They are often unnecessary and difficult to keep track of. 2. There are many grammatical and English usage errors. 3. I suggest adding a summary figure.