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 Experimental Medicine
ESPS manuscript NO: 14365
Title: Genetic test in multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 syndrome: An evolving story
Reviewer's code: 02520845
Reviewer's country: Croatia
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2014-10-02 10:34
Date reviewed: 2014-10-15 16:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review provides an overview on genetic testing of multiple endocrine neoplasia type I syndrome (MEN1). The author systematically described at first the epidemiology, clinical manifestations and diagnostic of MEN1, further the genetic tests of MEN1 gene mutations with recommendation for early subject identifications and finally the future perspectives in MEN1 genetic test. The text is accompanied by appropriate table of guidelines for screening the individuals with this syndrome. In literature review, recent researches are listed to this topic. In conclusion, this is a very interesting review which provides a view of problem in screening and genetic testing of subjects with MEN1 syndrome.

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 Experimental Medicine
ESPS manuscript NO: 14365
Title: Genetic test in multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 syndrome: An evolving story
Reviewer's code: 02616129
Reviewer's country: Taiwan
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2014-10-02 10:34
Date reviewed: 2014-10-16 15:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

MEN1 is a rare hereditary cancer syndrome and MEN1 gene is a tumor suppressor gene. This review article covers background material including a more in depth analysis of what MEN1 is. Additionally, this review article details specific in technologies and suggests guidelines for biochemical and instrumental screenings of MEN1 gene mutation. Particularly, it suggests a future possible development and application of a NGS targeted platform for the mutation analysis to reduce the possibility of false negative results. I thus highly recommend it to be published in this journal. Only one question is when (how soon) ad how much it costs for analysis of MEN1 by NGS in the future.

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 Experimental Medicine
ESPS manuscript NO: 14365
Title: Genetic test in multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 syndrome: An evolving story
Reviewer's code: 02608938
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2014-10-02 10:34
Date reviewed: 2014-10-18 02:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[Y] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

comments Marini et al. in this manuscript concisely reviewed the significance of testing genetic mutations of the MES1gene in the diagnosis of the MEN1 syndrome. This is a critical topic for the early and accurate prediction of the MEN1 syndrome in clinic, which has been strengthened by the authors. This review is informative for clinical practice. I would like to invite authors to address following issues before this review can be published. 1. Please check English grammar and wording. For example, in the first sentence on page 6, "the" should be used for MEN1 gene and a comma should be added between protein and menin. Ameliorate means to make a problem better or less painful. This word is used in the abstract for the performance of the test which is NOT a problem although it can be improved to become better. Abstract should be clear and appropriate wording. 2. Appropriate references should be provided for critical statements. For examples, no any reference is provided in the last paragraph on page 5, the first paragraph on page 6 et al. 3. The MEN1 gene has 12 exons in human as indicated by NCBI Gene database and UCSC genome database while this review still considers 10 exon hypothesis. Please explain the difference. 4. Considering that Lemos and Thakker analysed and summarized genetic mutations of the MEN1 gene in 2008 and no

additional similar analysis is reported since then as indicated by this review, the authors should summarize or comment on the mutations reported since then. 5. Some wordings in the technology section (page 10) are unclear. For example, PCR-based Sanger sequencing may be understood as gaining selective genomic locus by PCR followed by DNA sequencing or as integrating PCR into DNA sequencing itself which indeed is true for current Sanger's DNA sequencing. Again, this point became more confusion under the condition in which no relevant reference is cited. 6. NGS is not cheap in comparison to the PCR coupled DNA sequencing strategy if only a few loci are needed to be examined. However, NGS costs the same to provide a full picture of all mutations regardless the numbers relevant to a selected gene or genomic locus. However, it will be more expensive if the number of PCR and DNA sequencing is over a certain number. This issue should be pointed out.

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 Experimental Medicine
ESPS manuscript NO: 14365
Title: Genetic test in multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 syndrome: An evolving story
Reviewer's code: 02517857
Reviewer's country: Japan
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2014-10-02 10:34
Date reviewed: 2014-10-20 15:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comments 1. In introduction section, here the reviewer thinks that some information should be explained; the current approach for MEN1 diagnosis and its problem or limitation. What is the limitation and what kind of disadvantages are the in the current diagnosis procedure? The reviewer suggests imply the readers about the focus in this review article more specifically. Otherwise the article is vague. 2. In the second section, table 1, what is the evidence for the suggested guideline? How did the author set the starting age? 3. In the third section, how dose the precise diagnosis for MEN1 phenocopy affect the treatment plan or content of treatment? 4. What is the best timing for using NGS to diagnose MEN1? 5. How can NGS-based analysis combined to the current diagnostic approach or guidelines. Specific comments 1. P2l11. Please rethink the usage of "Anyway", the reviewer suggests to use other conjunctions such as "Although". 2. P2l11-14. The sentence is too long it is better to separate. 3. P2l15. I recommend using "review" instead of " manuscript". 4. P3l12-13. "MEN1 syndrome occurs as a result of tumor growth and associated metastases, which causes the over production of hormone." 5. P3l24. " An early diagnosis of . . . ". 6. P5l4. "the genetic defect, and disease predisposition, to the offspring, independently by sex.". Remove all three commas in the

sentences. 7. P5l12-14. Need to refer. 8. P5l14-18. Need to refer. 9. P5l18. “Anyway, the presence . . . “ Remove “Aneway”, start from “the presence of . . .” Reference. 10. P5l0-23. Referecere. 11. P5l24. “. . . allows an early identification of subjects who. . .Who. . . 12. P6l15. “Anyway, . . .” Use “However, . . . “ 13. P6l27. “They may have mutations in . . . “ Change expression as “It may have . . . “ 14. P6l28. “, or they may bear . . .” Change as “ it may bear . . .” 15. P8l4-5. “No more . . .” Change expression using relative pronoun. 16. P8l19. “individuation of a MEN1 mutation in a subject” hard to understand the meaning of this expression. Dose it mean the identification of mutation position or type in MEN1? 17. P8l23. The reviewer recommends to explain the table in more detail. What is the purpose to suggest the criteria for testing? 18. P10l1. “As already said above,” Change expression as “As already mentioned above”