

Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript ID: 88779

Title: Colon and Rectal Cancer: An Emergent Public Health Problem

Reviewers' comments:

Referee 1

Specific comments:

Comment 1:

#line 36. "his difference" >> "This difference"?"

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for typo correction. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 2:

#line 52 – 58. "it is estimated that about 65% of CRC cases develop sporadically, without any family history or predisposition to hereditary genetic mutations, occurring through somatic genomic and epigenetic alterations [4, 5]. In addition to sporadic cases, there is a smaller percentage of cases (25% of cases) with a familial association, as well as, hereditary cancer syndromes (representing only 5% of cases), and other unknown genomic alterations [2]. >> 65% sporadic and 25% familial, so how about the other 10% (=100-65 – 25)"?

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the valuable suggestion. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 3:

"line 81. "lasts for 10-20 years" >> please provide reference[s].

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the reference suggestion. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 4:

“line 129-131. “the American Cancer Society has reinforced the role of diet and physical activity as important determinants in CRC prevention [14]” >> What was the relationship between the American Cancer Society & ref-14?”

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the valuable suggestion and the appropriate reference was now inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 5:

“Line 172-3 “inherited RCC syndrome, individuals whose family history suggests a genetic predisposition to RCC” >> RCC or CRC?”

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the correction and error identification. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 6:

“Line 197 – 199 “American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC), is the most commonly used staging system and is based on the depth of intestinal wall invasion, the extent of regional lymph node involvement, and presence of distant sites of the disease [23]”. “Please double check because ref-23 was related to stomach but not colon.

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the valuable suggestion. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 7:

“line 212 “therapy [23].” >> Please double check because ref-23 was related to stomach but not colon.

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the valuable suggestion and the reference was checked and corrected.

Comment 8:

“line 298. Table 1? Or delete “table 1’?”

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the valuable correction, indeed is not Table 1 and is Figure 1.

Comment 9:

“Line 324-5 “The two molecular markers most implicated in the prognosis of patients with RCC” >> RCC or CRC?”

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the typo identification and correction. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 10:

“Line 327 -8. “Deletion of chromosome 18q is associated with a worse prognosis [32].>> Please double check because ref-32 was related to renal cancer but not colon cancer.

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the correction. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 11:

“Line 335 “that give rise to RCC” >> RCC or CRC?

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for the typo identification and correction. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Referee 2

Comment 1:

This paper provides an overview of research related to colorectal cancer (CRC). It highlights that CRC ranks third globally in terms of prevalence and second in mortality rate, with a projected doubling of incidence within the next decade. Organized screening programs exist in the United States and other European countries for people aged between 50 and 74 years old, and these measures have contributed to early diagnosis and improved health outcomes. Therefore, prevention and early diagnosis play significant roles in reducing the morbidity and mortality rates of CRC. The paper also discusses the latest scientific evidence regarding the pathology of CRC as well as its epidemiological status, and offers recommendations from a public health perspective. Some descriptions in the article are overly general, lacking concrete data support. For instance, while discussing preventive measures, it simply mentions "the need to strengthen healthy diets and regular exercise," without providing specific suggestions or data to support these opinions. The article cites some literature, but doesn't sufficiently explain or analyze them. This makes it difficult for readers to understand their importance and value. The language used in the article is somewhat stiff and awkward. For example, the sentence "Globally, colorectal cancer is the third most common type of cancer, and the second leading cause of death" could be expressed more concisely as "Colorectal cancer ranks third globally, with a high mortality rate."

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee overall comment of the manuscript and for the valuable suggestion. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 2:

"There are some errors in the text: Line 36 should read "this difference" instead of "his difference".

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the correction. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 3:

“Line 40 needs a subject before “is well-established.”

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee overall comment of the manuscript and for the valuable suggestion. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 4:

“The picture under Figure 1 does not match the description below”.

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee valuable correction and the description of the Figure 1 was now corrected to match the description.

Comment 5:

“Line 297 contains a mistake where “Figure 3” does not align with the image/table mentioned as “Table 1 Figure 1” below”.

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee valuable correction and the Figure 3 is now aligned in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 6:

“Line 340 has a repeated word “primary””.

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee for noticed the error and the repeated word as eliminated in the new version of the manuscript.

Comment 7:

"Lines 47, 53, 134, and 229 use the phrase "it is estimated that" too frequently, which could be varied for better readability. Please note that these corrections may not address every issue in the original text, additional revisions may be required".

The authors are grateful for the referee's valuable suggestions. The manuscript was revised accordingly and the suggested information was inserted in the new version of the manuscript. Moreover, the manuscript was entirely checked, being the corrections highlighted in a new version of the manuscript.

Reviewers' comments:

Referee 1

""The authors had addressed most of my previous comments except the below one. # section 1.3 "In this regard, the American Cancer Society has reinforced the role of diet and physical activity as important determinants in CRC prevention [17]." With ref-17 = Nutr Cancer . 2023;75(2):450-460 >> My question was that the authors of "Nutr Cancer . 2023;75(2):450-460" was not from "the American Cancer Society", so what was the relationship between the American Cancer Society & ref-17? Was ref-17 a statement paper by the American Cancer Society"? Please clarify.

".

Response to referee: The authors acknowledge the referee overall comment. Regarding the reference probably there is a misunderstood, the reference 17 is the following reference:

17. **E.L. Van Blarigan**, C.S. Fuchs, D. Niedzwiecki, S. Zhang, L.B. Saltz, R.J. Mayer, R.B. Mowat, R. Whittom, A. Hantel, A. Benson, D. Atienza, M. Messino, H. Kindler, A. Venook, S. Ogino, E.L. Giovannucci, K. Ng, J.A. Meyerhardt, Association of Survival With Adherence to the American Cancer Society Nutrition and Physical Activity Guidelines for Cancer Survivors After Colon Cancer Diagnosis: The CALGB 89803/Alliance Trial, JAMA Oncol 4(6) (2018) 783-790. [DOI:10.1001/jamaoncol.2018.0126]