

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 52253

Title: The significance of postoperative follow-up of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer using circulating tumor DNA

Reviewer's code: 00724702

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's country: India

Author's country: Czech Republic

Reviewer chosen by: Artificial Intelligence Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-11-10 05:57

Reviewer performed review: 2019-11-10 06:19

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Well written manuscript which would add value to the current established knowledge and evidence. The authors report that "In 22 cases of recurrence, ctDNA positivity was detected 22 times (22/22, 100%) compared to 16 positives (16/22, 73%) by imaging methods and 15 cases (15/22, 68%) of elevated tumor markers. Based on this they conclude that "ctDNA detection in patients with mCRC is a viable tool for early detection of disease recurrence". They should state the adequacy of the sample size to reach the stated conclusion.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 52253

Title: The significance of postoperative follow-up of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer using circulating tumor DNA

Reviewer's code: 03017516

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Senior Postdoctoral Fellow, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's country: France

Author's country: Czech Republic

Reviewer chosen by: Artificial Intelligence Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-11-01 08:07

Reviewer performed review: 2019-11-20 18:08

Review time: 19 Days and 10 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is very interesting, and it is very important to analyze the correlation between ctDNA, resection margin status, recurrence, metastases. The methodology is well explained. I have some minor remarks: - Introduction: may you focus more on the topic? The first part of the introduction is very generic, the paragraph starting with "other common sites.." is not so useful. I think you should shorten the Introduction eliminating most of the first part. - Methods: may you mention the costs of the ctDNA extraction? - Is the test reliable, did you test several times the same samples to assess the reproducibility of the test? - Did you compare the efficacy of ctDNA versus MRI in patients with liver metastases? - Did the detection of ctDNA change patients' management?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No