



**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**



**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**

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