



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 33667

**Title:** Structural shift of intestinal flora during chemo-preventive effects of EGCG on colorectal carcinogenesis in mice

**Reviewer's code:** 03536216

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2017-02-24

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-02

| 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing           | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <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"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair      | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor      |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |  | BPG Search:                                    |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No                    |  |

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In general, this manuscript provides the useful information about the relationship between epigallocatechin gallate and colorectal cancer. However, there are some problems and flaws in presentation. I hope that my comments are very useful for the improvement of this research. Major comments (1) In Discussion part: Authors described that EGCG prevention of colorectal cancer in this experiment. However, this experiment scheme did not elucidate the prevention of colorectal cancer. The development of colorectal cancer is generally known to three phases, i.e. initial mutation, cancer promotion and progression. The function of AOM is initial mutation and DSS is promotion of inflammation. In this experiment, EGCG administration was conducted at the same time as AOM/DSS administration. Therefore, EGCG may only inhibit initial mutation or promotion of inflammation. Even if EGCG only affects initial mutation or promotion of inflammation in colon, the present data that EGCG inhibit



**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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

colorectal cancer was found. There is a possibility that EGCG does not affect the cancer promotion and progression. In addition, EGCG has an inhibition function of AOM/DSS toxicity, there is a possibility that EGCG did not affect the three phases of colorectal cancer at all. Authors did not consider based on the above points in Discussion part. (2) In Discussion part: There is little consideration on the obtained data in this experiment. I think that authors should increase the consideration of the obtained data in this experiment. (3) Authors did not describe that the mechanism of how EGCG suppressed colorectal cancer. (4) The concentration of EGCG administration: Authors described "1% EGCG was given by intragastric administration in the intervention group throughout the experiment" (Page4). I do not know whether 1% EGCG is in diet or drinking water. Authors need to explain as readers can understand. Minor comments (1) Abbreviations in this manuscript are wrong usage, therefore, it should be checked again throughout. (2) Species name is italic type. I hope that my comments are very useful for the improvement of this manuscript.