

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 63373

Title: Liquid biopsy in cholangiocarcinoma: current status and future perspectives

Reviewer's code: 03738365

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-30 22:42

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-08 12:02

Review time: 8 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**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

The authors reviewed the morphological subtypes, epidemiology, etiology, mutation patterns, clinical manifestation, and diagnosis methods in the INTRODUCTION. Then, the authors reviewed various methods of liquid biopsy and illustrated the characteristic value in detection, treatment, monitoring and prognosis of CCA. This review covers almost all the current liquid biopsy methods, with clear logic and focused points. There are two minor revision that are essential. 1. At the line 5 paragraph5 of INTRODUCTION, the authors referred the features and advantages of CT and MRI. The opinion and the reference might be wrong. According to clinical commons and a lot of clinical studies, the MRI has absolutely advantage in discriminating between iCCA and HCC, evaluating the relationship of the tumor with the adjacent structures, the extent of local invasion. Please refer to more additional and updated research and make appropriate modification. 2. At the line 17 paragraph5 of INTRODUCTION, the authors mentioned that “fine-needle aspiration (FNA) that comes at the price of a high risk of tumor seeding”. This is a rather obsolete point of view. For recent decade, FNA have shown not significantly increase the risk of cancer spread. Actually, the most important risk of liver FNA is bleeding and infection. Please add more appropriate reference.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 63373

Title: Liquid biopsy in cholangiocarcinoma: current status and future perspectives

Reviewer's code: 02992461

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-08 02:43

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-13 02:18

Review time: 4 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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



**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

Liquid biopsy (LB) has been involved in a very active research field and gained remarkable attention. CCA still represents an unsolved challenge for clinicians and researchers. Therefore, this manuscript aimed to address the role of LB in CCA and proposed that LB would be as minimally invasive screening and diagnostic biomarkers, prognostic tools and therapeutic monitoring targets. (1) Additional information would be necessary to identify the difference or inner relationship between cfDNA and ctDNA (2) There are still some grammatical errors, such as “is is present...”

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 63373

Title: Liquid biopsy in cholangiocarcinoma: current status and future perspectives

Reviewer's code: 03738365

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-03 11:16

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-03 12:53

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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
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

No more comments to authors.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 63373

Title: Liquid biopsy in cholangiocarcinoma: current status and future perspectives

Reviewer's code: 02992461

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-08 01:48

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-09 09:25

Review time: 1 Day and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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
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

I think this review would be acceptable after revision.