

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 64293

Title: Genetic variation of TGF-B as a protective genotype for the development of colorectal cancer in men

Reviewer's code: 02941408

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-24 01:02

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-23 01:09

Review time: 27 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. I wonder whether the author had checked the normality of age and other examination values like TGF β . If those data were skewed distribution, it's not suitable to describe them by Mean(\pm SD). 2. I wonder how the study determined the sample size. It would be better If the author could elaborate on it. 3. It would be more concise if the Table 2, 3, and 4 became one table. In other words, three groups (advanced CRC, early CRC, and healthy control) can compare at the same time by other suitable statistics methods. 4. Figure 1 and Figure 2 also could be more concise by integrating counterpart data. Conclusively, my opinion on this article is a major revision.