

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 32966

Title: COLORECTAL CANCER POPULATION SCREENING PROGRAMS
WORLDWIDE IN 2016: AN UPDATE

Reviewer's code: 00033045

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-02-02

Date reviewed: 2017-02-03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

SUMMARY This manuscript is a review of colorectal cancer screening protocols around the world. This is a well-written article with good information. **MAJOR**

COMMENTS/REVISIONS - Given that this is a review article, there should be no section labeled as "Methods". **MINOR COMMENTS/REVISIONS** - None

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 32966

Title: COLORECTAL CANCER POPULATION SCREENING PROGRAMS WORLDWIDE IN 2016: AN UPDATE

Reviewer's code: 00057299

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-02-02

Date reviewed: 2017-02-20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

The present manuscript analyzed and summarized different CRC screening programs worldwide. The manuscript is very informative and well written. This reviewer has only minor comments. 1. In abstracts, similar phrase (e.g., Women were more apt to participate in screening programs, but men showed higher rates of positive test results) was repeated, and need to be concise. 2. On Page 15, Updated article regarding participation rates for CRC screening in South Korea has recently been published (Suh M, et al. Cancer Res Treat 2016 Nov 11 [Epub ahead of print]).