

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 56383

Title: Circulating tumor DNA: Where are we now? A mini review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 03478911

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Chief Technician, Executive Vice President, Research Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-29 17:25

Reviewer performed review: 2020-05-07 00:38

Review time: 7 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review, the author attempted to report the present state of utilizing the tumor-derived circulating DNA as a potential prognostic marker. It covers a very interesting topic, but it does not decide this review contains enough information, such as state-of-art technology. For example, in a certain section described "recent development of "ultra-sensitive" assays", there was no description of how it is performed, the clinical use, or any benefits about this technique. In another part, the order of the content showed illogical flow, because liquid biopsy should be described first before ctDNA detection. In some parts, the author seems to be confused, the analysis of circulating tumor cells (CTC) is different from circulating tumor DNA analysis. What's more, liquid biopsy for CTC utilizes most of "Cell research" products, therefore it should include the recent technology trends in such area. And considering the contents described according to each subject, it is thought that provides very general knowledge, it is difficult to judge that the authors have provided basic or clinical expertise.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 56383

Title: Circulating tumor DNA: Where are we now? A mini review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 02445433

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-30 11:29

Reviewer performed review: 2020-05-08 08:10

Review time: 7 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors resume some basic evidences about the role of ctDNA analysis for the diagnosis, prognosis, and therapeutic management of cancer patients. The minireview is interesting for the audience but after some minor revisions: 1. Some typos have been noted: exones, nivolumamb, 1 ng mg-1 2. I suggest using the terms circulating cell-free DNA instead of circulating free DNA or cell circulating free DNA. Please, use the same definition for cfDNA in the text. 3. "Opening he possibility for a new possible pharmacological approach to a disease, which is often associated with a poor survival." There is something no clear in this phrase....please control it. 4. "Correspondingly, Xu et al. developed and validated a combined prognosis score (cp-score) using 8 methylation markers found on ctDNA in addition to clinical, demographic and the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) stage. In their research, a cp-score ≤ 0.24 was determined to be low risk while a cp-score > 0.24 was classified as high risk, with a statistically significant median survival ($p < 0.0001$) (18)." The authors must give more details for this study such as the number of patients enrolled and the type of cancer. 5. The conclusion section need to be implemented, such as with a discussion about the advantages and limitations on the use of ctDNA analysis for cancer patients, as well as by giving information about the use of ctDNA in accepted clinical protocols and in clinical trials worldwide. A table containing this information will be very useful for readers. Future perspective should be introduced too.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 56383

Title: Circulating tumor DNA: Where are we now? A mini review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 02445433

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-29

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-08-05 10:52

Reviewer performed review: 2020-08-05 12:17

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The new table 1 needs a careful check: for the typo (e.g. tittle). Moreover, it needs a



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

legend for the abbreviations (e.g. BAL). Finally, the authors must indicate target instead of “ Mutation(s)/gene(s) under study”, and the N/A is not acceptable. The authors must indicate the target for N/A (e.g. ctDNA quantity). Last but not the least, the authors cite phase II-IV clinical trials, but the phase IV did not appear. The conclusion section needs a further improvement. Because this is a mini review, the authors must develop more discussion. For example, they can resume the advantage and disadvantages of the liquid biopsy on ctDNA and give more comments on the DNA analysis platforms (e.g. the most used).