PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 72974

Title: Gut mucosal microbiota profiles linked to colorectal cancer recurrence

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05072490

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-14 07:23

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-22 14:24

Review time: 8 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing
	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)
	[Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The principal aim of the authors is to investigate the relationship between gut mucosal microbiome profiles and CRC recurrence and prognosis. The aim is not totally innovative because there are already similar studies. The originality is in into the evaluation a cohort of Chinese patients and the different correlation analysis. The results are interesting and well discussed, but there are some critical points. 1) The authors use the words microbiota and microbiome as synonyms, but it is wrong because they analyse the taxonomic composition and so the microbiota not the microbiome (that is the genetics of microbiota). Please change microbiome in microbiota. 2) There are more figures and tables, I suggest to move some in additional materials 3) The authors did not cite some interesting papers such as doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2017.02699 (for the Fusobacterium nucleatum in CRC) and doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2017.01900 (for the T cell infiltration in CRC). Please add and discuss these manuscripts 4) The authors use frequently in discussion section the sentence "beneficial T cells" please specify what do you mean, Th1 or T CD8+ ?

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

| statements | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The novelty of this study is that the authors have   identified critical but unexpectedly bacterial profile that are associated with prognosis and survival of CRC patients and have suggested that intestinal microbiota can serve as biomarkers to predict the risk of CRC recurrence and death. The limitation of the study as stated by the authors is that the mechanism behind bacteria-driving CRC recurrence which is   different from those proposed for bacteria-driving CRC development is yet to be determined

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 72974

Title: Gut mucosal microbiota profiles linked to colorectal cancer recurrence

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05453795

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Singapore

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-07

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-01 03:09

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-01 03:17

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing
	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)
	[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No comments at this juncture