

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Methodology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7364

**Title:** End points of clinical trials in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: a systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 01212715

**Science editor:** Gou, Su-Xin

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-16 15:27

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-04 10:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript aims to systematically review the end points of 28 prospective clinical trials of chemotherapy and/or radiotherapy in hormonal-refractory prostate cancer. The main texts of the manuscript are 7 tables. But unfortunately, the author did not define the data in some tables very well, which will make readers confused. For example, what do the numbers in Result Column stand for in Table 5 and 6? Do they represent months or years? Why are the number expressions different in same column? What does "1" in the last column "Line" mean? The authors need to explain the data in the table to readers, not simply show readers the trial names and numbers. In addition, there is no clear conclusion at the end of the manuscript. The manuscript is not very well written. There are some language usage or grammar errors.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Methodology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7364

**Title:** End points of clinical trials in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: a systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 02456496

**Science editor:** Gou, Su-Xin

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-16 15:27

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-15 05:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors performed an interesting systematic review of the various endpoints used in clinical trials of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. Below are my specific comments on the manuscript: 1. There are multiple errors throughout the manuscript related to grammar, syntax, word choice and sentence construction. The manuscript needs to be edited by a native English speaker familiar with the subject and/or with proof-reading of scientific manuscripts. As it currently stands, the manuscript can be quite difficult to understand. 2. The authors state that they extracted data from two databases: PubMed and MEDLINE. I was under the impression that PubMed (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/>) includes all of the MEDLINE database as one of its subsets? Thus, a PubMed search should generate all the references that one could find in MEDLINE. 3. In the methods section, the authors should provide more detail on how data were extracted from the studies e.g. was this process performed by only one of the investigators or did two or all three of the investigators independently collect data that were later compared and reconciled? 4. In addition, the authors should also describe in the methods section any processes used for obtaining and confirming data from investigators. 5. In the discussion section, the authors should discuss any potential limitations of their systematic review (e.g. reporting bias and/or incomplete retrieval of identified research)

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Methodology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7364

**Title:** End points of clinical trials in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: a systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 00009616

**Science editor:** Gou, Su-Xin

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-16 15:27

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-18 14:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No comments. Good work.