



## Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

### ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5156

**Title:** Patient Perceptions of Stool DNA Testing for Pan-Digestive Cancer Screening: Exploratory Assessment by Survey Questionnaire

**Reviewer code:** 00061684

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-08-19 14:42

**Date reviewed:** 2013-08-21 16:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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)		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

This is an interesting manuscript. While the questionnaire showed acceptance among the persons asked it will then be shown in practice how many are really undergoing the testing.



## Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

### ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5156

**Title:** Patient Perceptions of Stool DNA Testing for Pan-Digestive Cancer Screening: Exploratory Assessment by Survey Questionnaire

**Reviewer code:** 00070310

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-08-19 14:42

**Date reviewed:** 2013-08-23 17:59

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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper evaluates stool DNA testing for pan-digestive cancer screening. This manuscript is interesting and most parts of the paper are clearly detailed. However, it will require some changes before it can be accepted for publication. 1, The authors mentioned that stool DNA testing was useful for detecting pan-digestive cancer. Please show the data except colorectal cancer. 2, Please show MUST in detail and impact the effect of MUST.



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5156

**Title:** Patient Perceptions of Stool DNA Testing for Pan-Digestive Cancer Screening: Exploratory Assessment by Survey Questionnaire

**Reviewer code:** 02446451

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-08-19 14:42

**Date reviewed:** 2013-09-06 16:56

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

This is a small questionnaire study exploring patient interest in MUST for screening. There is indeed no data on patient acceptability and perceptions of such approach. My comments are as below: 1) I am surprised and concerned that the study has not gone through the ethical committee in their institution. 2) I am uncertain why the authors choose the their study group from the Mayo clinic registry. Quite clearly this is going to be a bias response from this selected group. I do not think this sample is representative of the views from the general polpulation. At least we cannot extrapolate the data that way and this I think is the main criticism of this paper. Furthermore with this selected group of patients, the response rate is only 36%! I think the conclusion is only valid for Mayo clinic registry and cannot be extrapolate further. The paper could be enhanced by including this study in the general population not in the heavily bias selected group of patients from Mayo's clinic. 3) It would be good to include the questionnaire in this paper. It allows the readers to scrutinise the broad questions that were asked and whether they were phrased in such a way that would generate bias responses from the study group. There is also no attempt by the authors to pilot the questionnaire prior to sending out to the patient group. No reliability analysis (Cronbach alpha) were carried out on the 29-item survey questionnaire and this I think is another weakness of this paper.



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5156

**Title:** Patient Perceptions of Stool DNA Testing for Pan-Digestive Cancer Screening: Exploratory Assessment by Survey Questionnaire

**Reviewer code:** 00831111

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-08-19 14:42

**Date reviewed:** 2013-09-13 04:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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)		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

The authors examined the patient interest in MUST for screening of CRC and the common cancers above the colon. This is a well-designed study of survey questionnaire. The study limitations are well addressed in the discussion. I have the following concerns: 1. MUST is still an early study. Its sensitivity and specificity should be mentioned in the introduction. More details about pan GI screening of MUST should also be discussed in the introduction. 2. The patient interest is affected by the perfectness of MUST. This limitation should be addressed. 3. This study focused on pan-digestive screening. What is the rationale to include airway cancers? 4. Two references are missing. 5. P value for stool DNA test is missing in figure 1.