

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 83802

Title: MUTYH-associated polyposis: Is it time to change upper gastrointestinal

surveillance? A single-center case series and a literature overview

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03478404 Position: Editor-in-Chief Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-13

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-05 15:06

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-09 10:32

Review time: 3 Days and 19 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Generally, this manuscript, reporting on two patients with small bowel adenocarcinoma in MUTYH-associated Polyposis (without previous duodenal polyposis) fits the scope of the journal. There are rare reports regarding this situation. The manuscript is written in an elegant manner, easily to be followed. The scientific content in Introduction is based on the recent literature and emphasizes correctly the importance of the topic. Discussion paragraph is nicely approached. I have listed some comments for consideration, below: 1. Please insert the strength and limitations of your research. 2. Please insert (in Discussion) the literature review in a table, with all necessary data. 3. Both endoscopic images should have better resolution and more details in the Figure legend. 4. Please provide also the histopathological images for both cancers with details and a generous figure legend. 5. Table 1: for NCCN, the Figure legend mentions reference [25]. However, in the Table, for NCCN, it is mentioned "NCCN (v.1.2022)", which has reference [7]. Please revise. 6. Table 2 should contain more data. 7. Please revise the format of the manuscript, including references, in order to respect the requirements of the journal. 8. Reference 7 – please write the web address for MUTYH-associated polyposis, not the general address



of the site. 9. References 8 and 9 are identical. Please remove one of them and adjust in the whole text. 10. Please insert Authors' ORCID Numbers.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 83802

Title: MUTYH-associated polyposis: Is it time to change upper gastrointestinal

surveillance? A single-center case series and a literature overview

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02904061 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Doctor, Professor, Manager

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-13

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-11 14:29

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-19 09:23

Review time: 7 Days and 18 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for inviting me to review this article. The authors identified 2 (6%) cases of small-bowel adenocarcinoma with no prior history of duodenal polyps in a single-center MAP follow-up. Further combined with previous literature, suggested that a more perfect evaluation system and monitoring mode may be needed for small-bowel cancer in MAP patients, but a larger study is needed to verify it. A total of 38 MAP patients were followed up in the single center, each of whom had a clear gene variant. I would like to know if there is a genotypic-phenotypic correlation in this series of patients.