

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36519

Title: Stool mutations in gastric and colorectal neoplasia patients by next generation sequencing

Reviewer's code: 00183086

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-10-05

Date reviewed: 2017-10-11

Review time: 5 Days

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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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 interesting article with regard to potential detection of stool mutations in gastric and colorectal neoplasia patients by next generation sequencing. The refore, the article should be accepted for publication under minor revisions. 1. In the Introduction section additional discrimination of mutations among gastric and colorectal cancer patients is required. Grammatical errors should be corrected. The aim of the study is clear. 2. In the Methods section epidemiological data should be provided in the First paragraph. The section of next generation sequencing (NGS) should be better written. 3. In the Discussion section the structure should be re-organised. The Conclusion should be more concise. 4. The Information provided in the Tables should be reduced. 5. Newly published articles should also be included.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36519

Title: Stool mutations in gastric and colorectal neoplasia patients by next generation sequencing

Reviewer's code: 01714826

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-10-05

Date reviewed: 2017-10-13

Review time: 7 Days

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

This paper on genetic mutation detected in stool specimens from gastrointestinal tumors is rather interesting. Following are the major problems with this manuscript: 1. Change the title. It is not mutation of stool, but genetic mutation in stool specimens. 2. Methods. Number of volunteers is low; only 14 compared to the study group of 87. 3. No details of the stage of malignancies are provided in the patient group. 4. If the malignancies are all in the advanced stage finding mutations in the stool will not be helpful for early detection. 5. Age of the volunteers in two reported subjects is under 40. This is not comparable to the advanced age group in the cancer group. 6. Age and number of volunteers should be comparable to the study group. 7. Change or add table giving the details of patients with the stage of their cancer.