

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 69548

**Title:** Proton pump inhibitors and colorectal cancer - a systematic review of basic, epidemiological, and treatment studies.

**Reviewer's code:** 05775440

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Research Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Poland

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-05 02:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-09 11:09

**Review time:** 4 Days and 8 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES 2  
Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?  
YES 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES 4  
Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status  
and significance of the study? YES 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods  
(e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? YES  
6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study?  
What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?  
YES This review gives us a reminder about the careful use of PPI in CRC. 7 Discussion.  
Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting  
the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their  
applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the  
discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or  
relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? YES, YES, YES 8 Illustrations and tables. Are  
the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of  
the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?  
YES 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? YES  
10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? YES 11  
References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and  
authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author  
self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? YES, NO 12 Quality of  
manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and  
coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and  
appropriate? YES 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared

their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? YES 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? YES In this review, the author selected 28 studies to discuss the potential effect of PPI in CRC. The studies consist of 12 basic research studies, 11 epidemiological studies and 5 CRC treatment studies, which highlights an unexpected potential beneficial role of specific PPI agents in relation to CRC. Because of the common worldwide use of PPIs, this review gives us a reminder about the careful use of PPI in CRC. The manuscript is well-written and suggested to publish in our journal.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 69548

**Title:** Proton pump inhibitors and colorectal cancer - a systematic review of basic, epidemiological, and treatment studies.

**Reviewer's code:** 05119548

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** Poland

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-04 22:21

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-11 00:37

**Review time:** 6 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

It is an interesting review but not including much impact results. It may not be sufficient in research to obtain definitive results for the relation PPIs and CRC.