ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 10286
Title: Consumption of garlic and risk of colorectal cancer: an updated meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies
Reviewer code: 02520359
Science editor: Yuan Qi
Date sent for review: 2014-03-24 21:12
Date reviewed: 2014-04-06 14:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Well-conducted meta-analysis about an interseting topic

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 10286
Title: Consumption of garlic and risk of colorectal cancer: an updated meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies
Reviewer code: 02907426
Science editor: Yuan Qi
Date sent for review: 2014-03-24 21:12
Date reviewed: 2014-04-23 01:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[Y] High priority for
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic of the meta-analysis is well defined and clinically relevant because we need to know which are the environmental, particularly dietary, risk factors for the development of colorectal cancer. The number of patients involved is over 300000 and it very wide. The metanalysis has been well conducted and the paper is brief and easy to read Why didn't you analyzed individual patient data from studies? Why did you choose the Newcastle-Ottawa scale, an instrument not already validated? Are there other validated instrument that would be better?