



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJMMR/2644
Title of the Manuscript:	Gene Expression Profiling Identified High-mobility Group AT-hook 2 (HMGA2) as Being Frequently Upregulated in Esophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript by Cheung <i>et al.</i> examined gene datasets up-regulated in esophageal carcinomas by microarray analysis. They confirmed HMGA2 overexpression in the carcinomas by quantitative real-time PCR and immunostaining. Although the data is straightforward to show the role of HMGA2 in carcinoma progression, several major concerns should be settled.</p> <p>Major points</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approval for the ethical considerations to use carcinoma tissues by the institutional review boards must be mentioned in the materials and methods. 2. Figure legends were not provided. 3. In Fig. 1, fonts were too small. It is very hard to read. 4. Normal epithelium should be included in Fig. 2. 5. Expression of HMGA2 in esophageal carcinomas has been reported (Liu Q, <i>et al.</i>, Mol Biol Rep 39: 1239-46, 2012). Discussion with their data makes the manuscript in deep thought. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Materials and Methods section, consent for using clinical specimens for research has been stated. 2. Figure legends have been added. 3. Font size has been enlarged. 4. Immunohistochemical staining of HMGA2 in normal epithelium yielded no signal and has not been included in Fig. 2. This statement has been included in Results section. 5. In Discussion section, we have included the discussion on the paper mentioned by this reviewer.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. N for microarray analysis has not been described. 2. In Fig. 2, scale bars should be used for each panel in substitution for magnification folds. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have included in Figure Legends stating that the value of N is arbitrarily set to 1 for comparison. 2. Scale bars have been added.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		