

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_76847
Title of the Manuscript:	In Silico Analysis and Characterization of Differentially Expressed Genes to Distinguish Glioma Stem Cells from Normal Neural Stem Cells
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

PART 1: 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Authors demonstrated one novel approach to identify what potential targets differentially expressed in GSCs. There are at least three functional clustering pathways found from these studies. It is interesting for brain cancer research to compare which possible reasons will be in future. It is only two points need to be polished well.</p> <p>1. It's not sure in the Results and Discussion section that "The top three clusters were involved in glycoprotein disulphide bonds, melanocyte differentiation metallothionein domain, and had enrichment scores of 6.17, 2.35, and 2.15, respectively." is miss one comma in the sentence to find three clusters. It could be corrected well.</p> <p>2. In the discussion, it seems no any comments to recommend the results that will bring advantags for the diagnosis of glioblastoma. Although it is too preliminary to put any conclusion, it is better the value of this manuscript should be cited in the section.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chi-Ming Chiu
Department, University & Country	Ming-Chuan University, Taiwan