



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84117

Title: Diagnostic value of matrix metalloproteinases 2, 7 and 9 in urine for early detection of colorectal cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06110708

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Finland

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-20 02:17

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-20 09:55

Review time: 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript ‘Diagnostic value of matrix metalloproteinases 2, 7 and 9 in urine for early detection of colorectal cancer’ contains an interesting suggestion for the early diagnosis of clinical CRC. If CRC is found at an early stage, it can reduce the mortality of CRC significantly. So, a non-invasive and high diagnostic performance biomarker is urgently needed in the early diagnosis of clinical CRC. In this study, they detected CEA in serum and MMP2, MMP7, and MMP9 in urine in 59 healthy controls, 47 patients with colon polyps and 82 patients with CRC. The independent and combined diagnostic value of the indicators were also compared for detection of CRC. I congratulated authors for this topic. According to me this article can be accepted for publication



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84117

Title: Diagnostic value of matrix metalloproteinases 2, 7 and 9 in urine for early detection of colorectal cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06503083

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-14 09:00

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-21 09:35

Review time: 7 Days

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is generally well written and structured. Overall, this is a clear, concise, and well-written manuscript. The introduction is relevant and theory based. Sufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. However, in my opinion the paper has some shortcomings in regards to results and conclusions. Larger prospective studies are required to further define the diagnostic value of serum MMP9 for colorectal cancer in the early stage. In agreement with the authors, this study needs to be validated with larger prospective studies (including healthy volunteers and CRC patients in multicenter studies) for finding other markers with potential diagnostic value, or use artificial intelligence to establish a multi-indicator joint model with better diagnostic value. The only concern is the language. The manuscript can be improved by a more careful editing.