

## PEER -REVIEW REPORT

Author: Juan Carlos Trujillo-Reyes. Corresponding author

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade A (Excellent)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (High priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Lung cancer screening, what has changed after the latest evidence? COMMENTARIES To authors: It is an interesting work according to the expectation that exists within the medical community to have a stronger tool to improve the results achieved in the two compared clinical trials that was presented. Running title and acknowledgments is absent- Please provide them.

Answer: All the authors want to thank you your effort to review the paper and your conclusions. We provide the running title and the acknowledgments as you recommended us.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade A (Excellent)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (High priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** "The aim of this paper is to review the latest results of the NEderlands Leuven Longkanker Screenings Onderzoek (NELSON) and compare them with the findings of the National Lung Screening Trial (NLST). Both the NELSON and the NLST have provided sufficient scientific evidence to warrant widespread screening. LDCT is currently the test of choice." The article is concise and fluent, and the conclusion is instructive to the clinical practice of lung cancer screening.

Answer: All the authors want to thank you your effort to review the paper and your conclusions.

Reviewer #3:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade D (Fair)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** In this minireview, Juan Carlos Trujillo- Reyes and colleagues compared the results of NEderlands Leuven Longkanker Screenings Onderzoek (NELSON) to the findings of the National Lung Screening Trial (NLST) in the lung cancer screening policy. Generally, the information is limited and the article is not well written. There are some suggestions or this article. 1. In the abstract, no results or conclusion was provided which make this section more like an introduction. 2. In the main text, many paragraphs are made up of only one sentence. Please revise the manuscript to logical

paragraphs and avoid this condition. 3. In some issues, no reference is cited in whole section.

Answer: All the authors want to thank you your effort to review the paper and your suggestions.

1. We have included a conclusion at the end of the abstract
2. We have reviewed the whole paper to improve the logical of the paragraphs
3. We have included more references in the main text

#### **Editor review:**

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript is a minireview of lung cancer screening, what has changed after the latest evidence? The topic is in the scope of WJR.

(1) Classification: Grade A and D.

(2) Summary of the peer-review report: The article is concise and fluent, and the conclusion is instructive to the clinical practice of lung cancer screening, but the information is limited and the article is not well written.

(3) Format: 2 tables. 28 references were cited, including 7 references published in the last three years. No self-citation.

2 Language evaluation: Grade A and B. Language editing certificate was not properly provided.

3 Academic norms and rules: The conflict-of-interest disclosure was not properly provided, the Copyright License Agreement was provided. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck search and the Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments:

(1) Invited manuscript.

(2) Without financial support.

(3) Corresponding author has published 3 articles in WJCO.

5 Issues raised:

(1) The number of references is too small for a minireview.

6 Re-Review: Required.

7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Answer:

Dear editor, all the authors want to thank you your effort to review the paper and your conclusions.

We have reviewed the paper including all the suggestions recommended.

- Manuscript file: all the changes have been introduced using track changes to make easier your review

- the language certificate has been included

- the COI has been included

- Three more references have been included with a total of 31 references. The aim of the paper is focused on the analysis of just two randomised trials. It can explain the small number of reference but we can try to include more if you consider it.