

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17050

Title: ABILITY OF COMMUNITY-BASED PROSTATE CANCER SCREENING TO TARGET AN APPROPRIATE AND UNDERSERVED POPULATION

Reviewer's code: 02977114

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-02-09 16:09

Date reviewed: 2015-02-23 23:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input 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 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"/> 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

This is an interesting concept in a well-written editorial but requires far more detail before it should be published. -If the target of screening was "appropriate screening candidates and/or underserved population," the a priori definitions of each of these groups must be much more clear and the patient characteristics matching these definitions also must be clearer (i.e. how many patients did have a family history of prostate cancer? how many percent were actually appropriate screening candidates? what does underserved mean?). Right now it's just unclear to me what exactly the objective of the study is besides describing a population that the authors screened that may or may not be appropriate for screening. -A table comparing demographics of the cohort vs. demographics of the region (with appropriate statistics) should be included, since if 98% of patients in the cohort are Caucasian and 98% of the region is Caucasian, then you're doing OK. -A more thorough discussion of the relevant prostate screening implementation literature is also needed.