

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4604

Title: Accuracy of methylation markers of stool for early detection of colorectal cancer: A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 00058348

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-07-10 10:26

Date reviewed: 2013-07-23 11:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This meta-analysis determined the accuracy of DNA methylation biomarkers for early detection of colorectal cancer. This topic is extremely relevant to clinical practice and the data generated from the meta-analysis would provide evidence more convincing than a general review. However, the manuscript should be significantly improved in English. Specific comments: 1. I am not sure why colorectal adenoma was included in the study. However, since it has been included, it should be reflected in the title. 2. The authors should describe clearly the "Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria" in the Methods. 3. I don't understand what is meant by "344 articles excluded for duplicates". Please clarify further. 4. Some key outcomes such as diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) and summary receiver operative characteristic (SROC) curve should be defined in the Methods. 5. There are three curves in Figures 2c as well as 3c. Please describe them clearly. 6. The presentation of QUADAS score should be made appropriately. You may present the exact overall score for each of the studies in Table 1, and label Table 4 as a supplementary table. 7. Discussion may focus on your major findings, and their clinical significance. Also, any limitations of your meta-analysis should be commented. 8. The manuscript would be acceptable only after extensive editing.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4604

Title: Accuracy of methylation markers of stool for early detection of colorectal cancer: A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 00057695

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-07-10 10:26

Date reviewed: 2013-09-01 16:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have the following comments: 1. Specify that only randomized trials were studies for the meta-analysis. Materials and Methods: poor English made it difficult to understand the inclusion criteria. This needs to rephrase sentences for better comprehension. 2. Although you have included colorectal adenoma in the study, this term was not included in their keyword searches. 3. 334 articles were excluded for duplicates. What is meant by this? 4. Study characteristics: (Spain, et al). Delete et al. The same in Table 1: Vimentin et al. 5. Discussion is too brief. It needs to concentrate on discussing the findings of results. Moreover, the financial cost of this test as a screening tool for colorectal cancer deserves discussion. 6. Poor English throughout the text warrants revision and extensive editing by a person whose native language is English.