



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75074

**Title:** Micelles as potential drug delivery systems for colorectal cancer treatment

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02897448

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-16 02:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-16 12:39

**Review time:** 10 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

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

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors made an excellent review on the properties of polymeric micelles that make them promising drug delivery systems for colorectal cancer treatment and their application in colorectal cancer chemotherapy, gene therapy, as well as in combination cancer chemotherapy. However, there are a few issues that need the authors to be further demonstrated. 1. It is highly recommended that the authors elaborate more details on the mechanism and mode of action of the polymeric micelles system on cancer, or even explain it as a separate paragraph, better to be supplemented by necessary diagrams. 2. Are there any ongoing registered clinical trials about polymeric micelles and their application in CRC? If so, it is recommended that the authors make necessary summaries and comments.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75074

**Title:** Micelles as potential drug delivery systems for colorectal cancer treatment

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04966996

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-16 18:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-16 18:36

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Very interesting paper reviewing the application of this novel technology to deliver chemotherapeutics agent and molecules for treating colorectal cancer



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75074

**Title:** Micelles as potential drug delivery systems for colorectal cancer treatment

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03805255

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-16 22:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-03 05:09

**Review time:** 17 Days and 7 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 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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I am sending my review .

- 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? No . There is no explanation for criteria of literature search
- 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? There is no clear explanation, but this is the mini review
- 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Mainly Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Yes Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? The studies analyzed are mainly animal and on xenograft models, and their clinical relevance have not been confirmed.
- 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? There is no tables and illustration, but the presence of tables could improve clarity of the article
- 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? There is no statistic
- 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



**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

and discussion sections? Yes Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? No 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented?The organization could be improved as coherence and conciseness 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? It is review, not experimental study