PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Cancer*

Manuscript NO: 73891

Title: Learning Models for Colorectal Cancer Signature Reconstruction and Classification in Patients with Chronic Inflammatory Bowel Disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06080523

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-11 11:52

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-21 01:29

Review time: 9 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is very interesting and proposes a new methodology for data analysis. I suggest the authors include in the discussion the importance of the study in clinical practice, as CRC is one of the most feared complications among patients with IBD. The authors could also include in the discussion more data on miRNAs associated with CCR in patients with IBD, citing existing studies and even presenting the miRNAs identified in their own study.

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have no comments to underline