



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 37288

Title: TRANSLATIONAL PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH: A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON PATIENT-DERIVED XENOGRAFT MODELS

Reviewer's code: 03259512

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-12-06

Date reviewed: 2017-12-08

Review time: 1 Day

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

Authors collected the patient derived tumor samples (from pancreatic cancer patients) and transplanted those samples into nude mice in three different locations (intraperitoneal, subcutaneous and pancreatic). The xenografted tumor growth was evaluated and characterized using histological and immunohistochemical characteristics. Conclusion was not properly presented, although the conclusion is quite clear and supported by experimental data . The study is an interesting one and might attract a lot of attention. The study is based on in vivo animal xenografting. Authors try to develop new methods and find the best location for xenografting. That is an important, difficult, and novel technique. However, the English grammar and style remain to be improved. There are also several important points to address. Abstract: "Tumorgraft" is not commonly used difinition. I suggest replacing the "tumorgraft" with "tumour xenograft"



**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

all over the manuscript. Or author meant to use “tumor graft”? “There were no statistical differences...” should be “There were no significant differences...” You wrote: “However, a progressive decrease in fibrosis, fibrogenesis...”. This “decrease” was observed comparing to what? Clarify. You wrote : “...xenograft models promoted tumor growth..”. That is an incorrect statement and has to be re-written. What you really observed was successful growth of implanted patient derived tumor cells. “CONCLUSION: However, due to the...” – that is an incorrect English grammar and style. You are not supposed to start the Conclusion with word “however” that is followed by “ due to”. Please re-write conclusion. Methods and results The explanation/legend for Table 4 should be expanded. The table 4 should clearly present how angiogenesis, fibrogenesis, apoptosis were evaluated Author should indicate this either in the table or in the legend (cell proliferation (Ki67), cell death (TUNEL), angiogenesis (CD31) and fibrogenesis (α -smooth muscle actin, or alpha-SMA) etc). Author should add information in the method or discussion section why they used Cd31 as a marker of angiogenesis (references should be provided as well), and alpha-SMA – as a marker for fibrogenesis in pancreatic cancers. At the current version it is unclear whether it is logical (supported by previous data) to use those markers in pancreatic cancers. No immunohistochemistry was included. That decreases the value of the findings. Without those images, the conclusion cannot be considered as supported by data. Images of the subcutaneous xenografts (the area of the skin with the cancer) is desirable to include as well. Author should include representative images of H&E staining, alpha-SMA, or fluorescent images. TUNNEL images should be also presented. The data might look redundant to the data in the tables, but many researcher prefer to see real images and compare them with their own data instead of looking at the average number in the table. H&E staining is necessary to provide for comparison of F1,2,3 to the parental patient-derived tumors. It will increase the number of figures for the paper, but it also should increase the value of this study. Discussion Study limitation were not presented/not discussed at al. The authors missed to mention that pancreatic and intraperitoneal models are more invasive and thus might include more suffering/physiological burden in a mouse. That might be one of reasons why the tumor xenograft grows better subcutaneously.