PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 91413

Title: Colorectal cancer screening: A review of current knowledge and progress in research

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07253152

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Portugal

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-28 09:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-28 14:10

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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 statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Lopes et al reviewed the literature about colorectal cancer screening. the review is well done and the data are detailed. I really appreciated the paragraph on future prospects. I only have a few concerns: - the introduction should be more detailed in describing why the incidence varies in different populations and what the risk factors are. Furthermore, a brief description of the pathogenesis can help to better understand the rationale of some screening - methods relating to bibliographic research should be reported - the paragraphs on the various screening methods are well described. A summary table would be useful to orient the reader on the advantages and disadvantages of the various methods

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Excellent review - article. Kindly incorporate following modifications: 1. Your manuscript lacks images, algorithm regarding different screening methods for Colorectal Carcinoma. 2. The authors need to make a table depicting sensitivity and specificity of different screening methods mentioned in the manuscript. 3. The authors must add a paragraph regarding the economic viability of these screening methods as cost is an important aspect especially in developing nations. 4. The authors should add how the screening methods cab be improved and made more readily available at a very low cost. Thanks