



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 38099

Title: HER2 inhibition in gastro-oesophageal cancer: a review drawing on lessons learned from breast cancer

Reviewer's code: 00503561

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-01-26

Date reviewed: 2018-01-26

Review time: 0 Hour

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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a timely review. One possible addition is that this lesson can be extended to the other cancers (such as head and neck, lung, urological and gynecological malignancy) having HER2 amplification in a significant portion (greater than ALK in lung cancer I assume). Universal screening of HER2 would be one of the directions the author can mention and provide their same kind of insights.

Response from authors:

The incidence of HER2 amplification in lung cancer is 2-6%¹, which is less frequent than ALK rearrangements. HER2 amplification is rarely seen in head and neck cancer². Rates of HER2 amplification are higher in gynaecological and urological malignancies



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

but are variable and results from clinical trials so far have been negative and have not changed clinical paradigms.^{3,4} Therefore, as specialists in gastrointestinal cancers, we have not discussed universal HER2 screening and have instead focused our review on the innate differences between GOC and breast cancer, where HER2 testing plays a role in therapy.

References

- 1.F.R. Hirsch, M. Varella-Garcia, W.A. Franklin, R.Veve, L. Chen, B. Helfrich, *et al.* **Evaluation of HER-2/neu gene amplification and protein expression in non-small cell lung carcinomas.** *Br J Cancer*, 86 (May (9)) (2002), pp. 1449-1456.
2. Hanken H, Gaudin R, Gröbe A, Fraederich M, Eichhorn W, Smeets R, Simon R, Sauter G, Grupp K, Izbicki JR, Sehner S, Heiland M, Blessmann M. **HER2 expression and gene amplification is rarely detectable in patients with oral squamous cell carcinomas.** *J Oral Pathol Med.* 2014 Apr;43(4):304-8. doi: 10.1111/jop.12173. Epub 2014 Mar 20. PMID: 24645976
3. Hodeib M, Serna-Gallegos T, Tewari KS. 2015;11(23):3113-31. doi: 10.2217/fon.15.266. Epub 2015 Nov 24. **A review of HER2-targeted therapy in breast and ovarian cancer: lessons from antiquity - CLEOPATRA and PENELOPE.** *Future Oncol.* 2015;11(23):3113-31. doi: 10.2217/fon.15.266. Epub 2015 Nov 24.
- 4.M.H. Hussain, G.R. MacVicar, D.P. Petrylak, *et al.* **Trastuzumab, paclitaxel, carboplatin, and gemcitabine in advanced human epidermal growth factor receptor-2/neu-positive urothelial carcinoma: results of a multicenter phase II National Cancer Institute trial** *J Clin Oncol*, 25 (2007), p. 2218



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 38099

Title: HER2 inhibition in gastro-oesophageal cancer: a review drawing on lessons learned from breast cancer

Reviewer’s code: 01003401

Reviewer’s country: Reviewer_Country

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2018-01-26

Date reviewed: 2018-02-02

Review time: 7 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a good review, but I did not see the Figure one, pls add it to the draft.

Response from authors:

Figure 1 has been added to the manuscript.