

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Respirology

**Manuscript NO:** 34314

**Title:** Is the determination of ctDNA a scientific “spy” that foresees cancer?

**Reviewer’s code:** 02497043

**Reviewer’s country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-03

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The title in the e-mail: « Are liquid biopsies a scientific “spy” that foresees cancer before any clinical and diagnostic tools? » The title in the downloaded manuscript file: « Are liquid biopsies a scientific “spy” that foresees cancer ? » Which one is right? 2. The purpose of this manuscript is neither the "summary" nor the "introduction" section. Needs to be added. 3. Introduction section ; Paragraph 1: “Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer death worldwide in both men and women due to growth and aging of population. The global lung cancer burden of annual cases is expected to double by 2050 [1].” It is not appropriate that the first part of the introduction is related to lung cancer. Because, this manuscript describes the liquid biopsy not only the lung cancer, but the general cancers.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Respirology

**Manuscript NO:** 34314

**Title:** Is the determination of ctDNA a scientific “spy” that foresees cancer?

**Reviewer’s code:** 00608210

**Reviewer’s country:** Thailand

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-03

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, I thank you very much for giving the opportunity to review this manuscript. This topic is interesting. However, there are some major and minor comments. Besides, there are many grammar errors. The authors should consider professional and/or native English speaker advice for writing the academic manuscript. Below are my comments. Major

- For lung cancer, please summarize the ctDNA sequences that have been already processed for liquid biopsies in clinical practice such as EGFR mutation, ALK, KRAS, or other else and also provide the accuracy of each.
- Page 3 “When compared tissue samples with ctDNA, by sequencing method, the results reported showed, an overall accuracy of 87% (336/386 patients)” Which ctDNA sequences that they applied? The reference that the authors cited was only News!!
- Page 5 cost benefit, routine clinical practice and Table 1.
  - o Please provide the references.
  - o Which ctDNA sequences that the authors recommend to check for early detection, evaluate relapse and how often? There are many questions to use liquid biopsies in these ways. In addition, is it really cost-effective? The authors should not use their opinions



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

without evidence-based data in this review. Minor • The words that have abbreviation should be used with abbreviation, such as ctDNA, cfDNA throughout the manuscript. • The authors should not cite as ASCO 2016 or News. Please show the references that the readers can further read. • Many grammar errors and not academic writing. • Please correct reference style.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Respiriology

**Manuscript NO:** 34314

**Title:** Is the determination of ctDNA a scientific “spy” that foresees cancer?

**Reviewer’s code:** 00608195

**Reviewer’s country:** Portugal

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-03

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very nice review of the importance of the circulating tumour DNA as a biomarker for the continuum of cancer. Nevertheless, the authors confound the term “liquid biopsy”, used in several titles, with the determination of the ctDNA, because liquid biopsy is much more than this – determination of the circulating tumour cells, exosomes, RNA, etc. So, and because the paper is interesting and it is very well written with a clear English, I propose that the authors change the titles, for instance, to “Are the determination of ctDNA a scientific “spy” that foresees cancer?”.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Respirology

**Manuscript NO:** 34314

**Title:** Is the determination of ctDNA a scientific "spy" that foresees cancer?

**Reviewer's code:** 00608206

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-03

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review of the manuscript: Manuscript NO: 34314 Title: Are liquid biopsies a scientific "spy" that foresees cancer ? Invited manuscript, The article presents an updated review of the liquid biopsy (detection of free circulating DNA in blood). I consider that the review is well written, understandable and addresses the main questions related to the topic: definition, history, utility, sensitivity and specificity of the test, advantages and disadvantages and possible future use. It clearly presents many of the advantages of a liquid biopsy but I think it should further develop the reasons why it is not yet a standard clinical practice. The structure of the article is adequate and the bibliography is updated. It could be worth to include in the bibliography some relevant article of some of the authors on the subject.