

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7200

**Title:** The detection of colorectal tumour by the promoter hypermethylation of Wnt antagonist genes in faecal samples

**Reviewer code:** 02446726

**Science editor:** Zhai, Huan-Huan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-09 21:37

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-02 17:55

| CLASSIFICATION                                     | LANGUAGE EVALUATION   | RECOMMENDATION                      | 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good) | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)            |   | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision     |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, in principal you present intriguing data worth reporting. You should aim at addressing all major and minor issues before the manuscript can be considered suitable for publication.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7200

**Title:** The detection of colorectal tumour by the promoter hypermethylation of Wnt antagonist genes in faecal samples

**Reviewer code:** 01804246

**Science editor:** Zhai, Huan-Huan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-09 21:37

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-15 04:04

| CLASSIFICATION                               | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | RECOMMENDATION                      | 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"/> Existed    | <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"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)      | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)      |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I was asked to review the paper entitled : "The detection of colorectal tumour by the promoter hypermethylation of Wnt antagonist genes in faecal samples" by Hu Zhang and colab. It is an interesting paper, however, in my opinion, some major revision should be made before publishing. Here are my comments: Major issues: 1. I think that the statistical analysis is incomplete. The Sensitivity, Specificity, PPV and NPV as well as the accuracy of the evaluated tests should be calculated. It will not be hard to do since in all cases a gold-standard is available. 2. In the results section you mention a group of controls but they are not mentioned in the methods section. Which were the criteria you used for defining normal controls. Minor issues 1. Throughout the manuscript you misspelled the name of Dukes classification in CRC: it was either Duck, or Duks, only in the table it was correct 2. FOBT was performed with or without diet with meat restriction? 3. I think that some considerations regarding the price and availability of the analyzed tests should be made 4. English language should be intensely reviewed since in some places, due to poor English, the text is difficult to read.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7200

**Title:** The detection of colorectal tumour by the promoter hypermethylation of Wnt antagonist genes in faecal samples

**Reviewer code:** 00562236

**Science editor:** Zhai, Huan-Huan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-09 21:37

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-20 00:48

| CLASSIFICATION                               | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | RECOMMENDATION                      | 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"/> Existed    | <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"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)      | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)      |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled: The detection of colorectal tumour by the promoter hypermethylation of Wnt antagonist genes in faecal samples, by Hu Zhang and coauthors, reports an interesting study on early diagnosis of colorectal tumours. However, it needs to be revised, formally and substantially. In particular some points need to be addressed: 1. In the Materials and Methods section, the authors should describe in more details their patients, (actually they are presented only in the Results section of the paper) in order to let the reader know what they are talking about. A table may be useful there. 2. Normal controls should be defined more precisely. 3. Results should be reported for patients, not for lesions. 4. The name Dukes should be used for staging classification (not Duck or others). 5. Discuss the cost/benefit of the hypermethylation test in stools for the early detection of colorectal lesions. 6. In some passages of the text the meaning is obscure, and language style should be reviewed and somewhat simplified. Minor points 1. Table 2 should be better divided in rows for each lesion (CRC, adenomas, hyperplastic polyps and so on) like table 1. 2. In the References section, I guess that the date of publication should be deleted. 3. I suggest to consider a few other works on hypermethylation in early colorectal lesions (i.e., Int J Cancer 2005;115:747. Carcinogenesis 2007;28:769. Oncol Rep 2007;17:1421).