



**ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14513

**Title:** Palliative Chemotherapy for Gastroesophageal Cancer in Old and Very Old Patients: A Retrospective Cohort Study at the National Center for Tumor Diseases Heidelberg

**Reviewer code:** 00055107

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-09 08:54

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-23 01:58

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Authors investigate the toxicities and survival rate of several palliative chemotherapies in very old patients suffering from advanced gastroesophageal cancer. They suggest the use of doublet combinations of chemotherapy for first-line treatment whenever possible in old and even very old patients. In cases of tumor progression, second-line chemotherapy should be offered to the aged patients when they are in good performance status. I consider that the quality of this paper would be improved by the addition of several small points. The number of patients receiving doublet and triplet therapies is not clear because these values are different in the text of the Results (48 and 3 respectively) instead in the Table 2 (47 and 5 respectively). Which values are the correct? In Table 2, the addition of the number of patients under "Doublet therapy" is 48 and not 47 at it is stated in the table. In the abstract, authors stated "87% of patients received a combination of two cytotoxic drugs". This value corresponds to 48 patients under doublet therapy from a total of 55. Please, revise these data. In the abstract, authors stated that the median overall survival (OS) of patients with ECOG 2-3 is "3.7", whereas in the Results section and in the Figure 2 this value is "3.8". In Table 2 appear "Participation in clinical study: 3 (5.5 %)". Is there any explanation in the text of Results about this point? In Table 2, several terms should be included in full in the table legend: "FLO", "FLP", "XP", "FOLFIRI" .... Similarly, in the abstract, the term "FLO" should also be written in full:



## 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>

---

"5-fluorouracil", as well as the term "FOLFOX" in the Discussion section. Some English mistakes should be corrected: "Multivariate analysis war performed", "emarkebly", "prevoius", "decicions".



# 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

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14513

**Title:** Palliative Chemotherapy for Gastroesophageal Cancer in Old and Very Old Patients: A Retrospective Cohort Study at the National Center for Tumor Diseases Heidelberg

**Reviewer code:** 00054174

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-09 08:54

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-03 07:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The MS has a high significance and novelty. The study design is fair. Generally speaking, the presentation and organization of the MS is good, the quality of language is good. This manuscript describes a single-center clinical study on the effects of palliative chemotherapy in old patients with gastroesophageal cancer. The technique is not novel but the subject of research is ignored by academic world. Comments: 1. The subject of research is ignored by academic world, but the technique is not novel in this reseach and Authors` conclusion did not bring new idea for palliative chemotherapy of gastroesophageal cancer. 2. Please explain "palliative gastroesophageal caner" in conclusion of abstract.